

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK  
PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
MARCH 17, 2011**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, March 17, 2011 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 Kathleen Sullivan, Boardmember Jamie Cameron, Boardmember Eva Alligood, Boardmember Bruce Dale, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, Deputy Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, and Deputy Village Clerk Mary Ellen Healy

**Chairperson Speranza:** Good evening. I'd like to call the meeting of the Planning Board to order. It is Thursday, March 17. Happy Saint Patrick's Day everybody.

**I. ROLL CALL**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Meeting of January 20, 2011**

**Chairperson Speranza:** Hard to believe we didn't get together in February, but it was a long winter. It was kind of nice to have the month off. So any changes or modifications to the minutes from January 20?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I have one, I think, on page nine: "*On MOTION of Boardmember Sullivan ...*" I don't believe that was me. I think it was Ms. Alligood. Because I am not yet seconding things, being a new Boardmember.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 20, 2011 were approved as amended.

**III. PUBLIC HEARING**

**New Business**

**Accessory apartment permit renewal for Dan Hsu & Mei Wu – 81 Summit Drive - Sheet 18/Block 654/Lots 15,16,17,18,19. Waiver required for parking.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** The next item of business is a public hearing for an accessory apartment permit renewal for property located at 81 Summit Drive. Mr. Hsu, I know you've been here before several times.

There is a change from the application that we've received that has to do with parking. There will be a parking waiver required. That's not indicated on our application. It does fall within the 25 percent of the main building requirement, so there's no waiver needed for the square footage.

This is a public hearing, so I'd like to know if anyone here wants to speak on the application. No? Hearing no comments, then we'll close the public hearing, and I will ask if there are any comments or questions from the Boardmembers.

Hearing none, is there a motion for approval?

On MOTION of Boardmember Alligood, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board approved the renewal of the application for the accessory apartment at 81 Summit Drive with a waiver for off-street parking.

#### **IV. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION ITEM**

**Chairperson Speranza:** There is a new item that's come to us for a preliminary discussion, and it's got to do with property at 6 Nichols Drive. The Board will be taking no action on this tonight, but the applicant would like to give us an indication of what is being proposed.

So Mr. Lewis, if you'd like to come up and describe your proposal.

**Michael Lewis – Michael Lewis Architects, PC:** This project at 6 Nichols Drive is just a modest renovation that is primarily interior work, but also includes construction of a trellis-arbor over an existing terrace. That, and some window replacement, is the extent of the exterior work, so there is no proposed changes to the footprint, no changes to the lot coverage, no changes to any of the drainage characteristics of the site whatsoever proposed in the application.

However, my understanding is that even though there is essentially no impact to the site, since it's a site with steep slopes – the property is very steep, primarily in this area coming up behind the house – we're required to submit for a steep slope review. We're asking that the requirements be waived to the fullest extent that they can be to avoid unnecessary cost to the owner for the topo, the engineering fees, our time; and also not to waste your time. It just seems prudent.

Again, no impact to the site. I guess I apologize for getting this so late. I really lost track of the scheduling. We're trying to submit this – submit the drawings – tomorrow, actually, to the Building Department to get on the agenda for the Zoning Board – this trellis does require a variance – for the April 28 Zoning Board meeting.

And so, again, we respectfully ask if we can get some resolution from this prior to that so that we can stay on that schedule. It would be most appreciated.

**Chairperson Speranza:** The way the process works, because this is an application for a building permit on a lot that contains steep slopes, the Building Inspector reviews it and then sends it on to the Planning Board. We, the Planning Board, can waive the requirements for a lot of the paperwork, the plans that would have to be submitted, as we see fit to do. There is one requirement that we cannot waive – it's specifically prohibited in the code – and that's the public notice.

So this application would have to be noticed for a future Planning Board meeting. I know we've just seen this. You've heard Mr. Lewis' description of the project. And I'd like to hear if Boardmembers feel that we can waive a lot of the requirements in the code. We do have the code, or the steep slopes ordinance, if you want to go through exactly what it would be that we are waiving. But we would have to have it on the agenda for our next Board meeting.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Do you want to add anything?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, just to clarify. The only thing, it's not a regular public notice. It has to just be to the adjacent property.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's right, yes.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** It doesn't have to be in the newspaper, and 500 feet and everything – just the adjacent.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right. Jamie?

**Boardmember Cameron:** I guess the applicant can tell me, have you already submitted this to the Building Department?

**Mr. Lewis:** No, sir.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You missed that. Because our plan – our law, at least what I recall – was that you submit it to the Building Department. The Building Inspector might say, "Well, all these things would be required." If they were useless ... I've looked at it, it looks fine. And then we were going to nod our heads. But you've gone around that one by not giving it to the Building Department, which leads to this thing.

So I guess I think we should waive it, personally. That's just my personal view. But I have two subjects when I get to that point. One is, if a whole bunch of your neighbors come in and point out something well, then, I'm going to listen to that at the next Board meeting, once you've given notice.

And the second thing is, if the Building Department says, "Well, no, but ..." and I look to see where your arbor is. You arbor doesn't involve creating, to the best I can tell, a new terrace. So that doesn't seem to be an issue. But again, if the Building Department comes up with something I'd like to reserve my right to look at that, too.

Other than that – and I was here earlier, and looking at it – I feel good about it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Let me understand. You're submitting it to the Building Department tomorrow. So it would be at our next meeting that the Building Inspector would say, "Well, I recommend that you waive this." The notice will have been given at that point.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right. So I think we'll get there next meeting.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I just want to say that I can't say now that I would waive it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Agreed.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I'm just saying now that if no neighbors come out and complain for some reason, and if the Building Department says it's good, I think I'm good to go.

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes, I think you're absolutely right. It's asking for things that aren't really clearly delineated as completely doable. The other thing is that, technically, they want the steep slope review prior to booking the zoning. You know, they're sequential. They want the planning review prior to the zoning.

Again, my take on it – and, of course, it's just from my perspective as somebody working on the project, granted – is that it's as I explained. There aren't really any issues to even really focus on, although it makes sense to focus on the drawings and look at that. And so again, my hope is if I can just find some way to keep on schedule for the clients and make this April 28 Zoning Board, that would be great.

If you could maybe even issue a statement that in your opinion it should be allowed on the agenda, with the reservation that if something does come up it would be removed from the agenda, or something like that, it might be helpful. If you don't feel that you can do that, then I'll just go lobby for that myself with the Building Department, and they're pretty workable, generally. But whatever you think.

Appreciate your help very much. Thanks.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Just to clarify, the Planning Board meeting will take place before the Zoning Board. We won't have enough time to say, "Yes, we refer you to the Zoning Board." But I don't see an issue with that.

And the other thing I wanted to note is that from what I recollect about our reasoning – and the Steep Slopes Law and having the notice to neighbors – is really to make sure that if they anticipate any runoff issues or things related to the disturbance of the steep slope, that's what ... it's designed to enable them to speak up and say, "You know, there's a history with this property." And from what I see, that wouldn't be the case here.

So again, we can't say definitively that this won't be an issue, but I can't imagine what neighbors would have ... what issues they would have related to the steep slope in this proposal.

**Boardmember Cameron:** We actually discussed your exact situation when this law was changed.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right.

**Boardmember Cameron:** And we decided that somebody would go to the Building Department. The Building Department would say, "Well, don't submit anything. I'm sure

the Planning Board will say it's fine." And then we'd come here and we'd discuss it with the Building Department representative and we'd say it's fine. And we figured that was a pretty good way to go.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** Yes, the Building Department will be doing a full review of this set of plans before next month's meeting. So if there is any problems or any issues that we find, it'll definitely be addressed and we'll make our recommendation before the next Planning Board meeting.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Kathy, anything? Concerns?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Not really. I mean, I support the ability to waive requirements, especially if it's a cost that is not necessary based on the facts that Mike had explained.

I wouldn't question, but I just would suggest that as people look at the plans, given that there isn't any real great grading change, that potentially some small soil erosion means are put into place; you know, a silt fence or straw bales or something like that. It sounds like there might be some small excavation. No? Then I leave it to your judgment.

That's the only thing I could think of, is that there may be some small disturbances to create new footings. But that's the only thing I would suggest.

**Mr. Lewis:** No. The support is entirely over an existing-built structure, so there wouldn't be any ...

**Boardmember Sullivan:** So totally, no ground disturbance?

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes. I think if there were, as soon as there would be a site disturbance I think even if it were minor, it would certainly kick it over. It becomes a judgment: what's minor, what's not. But in this case, there isn't any.

But the point is well-taken. And not only is there no impact to the site proposed in the work, but also there are no construction operations that we could foresee that would have any real impact on the site even. I mean, they're not going to need to set up a storage yard or anything like that for this work. It's a small project and it's minor interior work.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I have to say, in that case I find it problematic that steep slopes comes into play on this application.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It's anything that requires the building permit. I mean, you're right. These are the kinds of things, when the steep slopes ordinance was revised, we tried to revise it that obviously this is a much smaller kind of improvement than we had even considered. Which is why we made the provision so that we could waive everything but the notice for when the meeting would be.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You could be adding another floor to the building, and that might actually indirectly cause some different water runoff on the roofs. I mean, I think our thought was that we were trying not to, but we thought we had the timing because you had submitted.

And also, quite candidly, having sent out the notice – which you have to for the neighbors – we couldn't possibly waive it before the neighbors have an opportunity to come and say something. That would be just atrocious: "We sent out a notice, but we've already waived it."

**Mr. Lewis:** Right.

**Boardmember Cameron:** So it's a useless notice.

**Mr. Lewis:** It's pretty clear the way it's written. I guess I think the ordinance could be improved if it made some allowance for work that requires a permit, but does not warrant a steep slope review – interior work, technically, if you're changing the bathroom around – you need to go for a steep slopes review.

Which, in fact, could trigger a lawsuit, I think, actually. I would never consider it, but I could imagine that someone might, where it's just unreasonable.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I think there could be some refining.

**Boardmember Cameron:** By the time they brought a lawsuit, the thing would be over. So you could say that, but it's largely ridiculous, quite frankly.

**Boardmember Dale:** What is the variance you need from the Zoning Board? Does it pertain to the trellis?

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes. The existing garage is about 7 foot 8 inches back from the lot line in the front. If you look at the site plan, the whole structure is right down on the street. And then there's this long yard up behind it with very little on it. And there are about four houses that are almost identical on Nichols Drive that have this characteristic.

So they're not set back from the front at all. They're set back less than 8 feet, and it's a 30-foot requirement. So technically, anything that's built practically anywhere on the house would require a variance. This trellis is fully within the setback area so it immediately triggers a front and side variance requirement.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Because it's existing nonconforming.

**Mr. Lewis:** Right. It's increasing the nonconformity.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yes, the trellis is in the front yard so you're actually doing a nonconforming to a nonconforming.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right.

**Mr. Lewis:** Here's a photograph of the houses. And you can see, with that flat front façade, this unmitigated front façade, it's crying out for some horizontal element to mitigate it.

So I don't expect we'll have much trouble getting it through. I think it'll be a big improvement. But it's totally nonconforming.

**Boardmember Dale:** The trellis is over the garage?

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes, sir, just over the garage.

**Boardmember Cameron:** So you own the house?

**Mr. Lewis:** No. For my clients.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You just don't mention their name. That's curious.

**Mr. Lewis:** David and Ann Pugh.

**Chairperson Speranza:** OK, so submit the plans to the Building Department, and we'll make sure that you're on the agenda for the next meeting, assuming that the timing works out with the review by the Building Department. And I see no reason why it couldn't also plan to be on the Zoning Board of Appeals. It should not be held back at this point, pending Planning Board, since we will have met the week before.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** I don't see it being an issue.



**Mr. Lewis:** Thank you so much. Appreciate it.

## V. ANNOUNCEMENTS

### **Next Meeting Date - April 21, 2011**

**Chairperson Speranza:** Our next meeting date is April 21. That falls during the school break.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I just want to get a sense as to whether or not people feel we should change it. It's also Holy Thursday during the week leading up to Easter.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I am not going to be out of town, so it won't be a problem for me.

**Chairperson Speranza:** OK, so you'll be here. Anybody else?

**Boardmember Dale:** I may be. I'm trying to remember the dates now. My daughter's school is different than Hastings schools, so it's confusing. I think we're away the 16th through the 23rd.

**Chairperson Speranza:** OK. All right, so we'll confirm. Right now, we'll plan to leave it unless it seems that we won't have a quorum. But even so, Bruce, you'd be out that whole week. So we'll have to think about it, in case you won't be here. I'll check with Ed and I'll check with Fred and I'll check with Rhoda. Because Rhoda could always be here.

And again, we don't know what would be on the agenda right now, other than this. Marianne, are you good for that?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** The 21st? Yes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** OK, good.

## VI. Discussion

### 1. Greening the Village Code

**Chairperson Speranza:** OK. Just because we didn't meet in February doesn't mean there wasn't lots going on. And what I'd like to do is just talk about a couple of things and ask others to talk about a couple of things, as well.

And Bruce, I know I'm putting you on the spot here. The greening of the code, I've kind of lost track of it. I backed away from it because there was so much else going on. And I know that there were Webinars, and there was a charette that was held. I'm just wondering if you could just give us a little update as far as where that is.

**Boardmember Dale:** It's stalled, actually, and it was moving very nicely.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes.

**Boardmember Dale:** And it was a lot to digest. But the Webinar was pretty helpful. And then also one of the participants who was somewhat of an expert on all of this, and a professor, helped clarify it. But that's where we stalled.

There are two pieces. One is the residential piece, which people are really astounded it's not a code. And there's a general feeling that that's not acceptable as a means of progressing. And that the code is much more ... it's clearer, it's more definitive. And even though there's some options and choices that we need to make, and choices that the professionals can make in how they meet the code, there was a feeling that it would be best if the residential piece could be folded into the code itself, and drop the standard.

Our local expert, Bill Bobenhausen, felt that the code was written in such a way that you couldn't take the residential piece because the type of housing that gets built in Hastings wouldn't fit that code. It wasn't meant for a series of row houses or a series of townhouses. It was meant for buildings that have a certain size and more – 50,000 square feet or more.

He insisted that it wasn't acceptable. So then there was a reaching out to the people, the code people, again, who ran the Webinar.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right, from the state.

**Boardmember Dale:** And they came back with a somewhat ambiguous answer, which was, "Yes, that's correct." However, there are many regions and localities who have come up with a series of recommendations that would amend the code so that it could work in that circumstance. And they just gave us several examples of that.

And I think Kerry-Jane is, at this point, blocked in the sense of not knowing how to get beyond that. Because a lot of time has passed since we've had another meeting, and it seems they're leery about bringing a whole group together to make that decision. And yet it's hard to make that decision. There was no clarity on how we could proceed on that issue.

So I think Kerry-Jane needs to be encouraged to call a public meeting, or call a meeting of the full group, and see what we want to do about this issue. Because it really is somewhat of a stumbling block.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** The last time we met was in January, correct?

**Boardmember Dale:** We were moving along very nicely. It was a really intense pace.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, it was. I know there were lots of e-mails and lots of meetings set up.

**Boardmember Dale:** And people felt very good about the code. I mean, for the most part I think there was the feeling that this could easily be adopted. But then we stalled.

**Chairperson Speranza:** All right, I was curious.

## 2. T-Mobile Application

**Chairperson Speranza:** Something else that we have talked about, and maybe we can get some information about, the T-Mobile application. Did they ever go to the Zoning Board? No, they never made application?

**Boardmember Dale:** And they've never painted the ...

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You just keep sending those letters about the general sign. But I don't know what they're doing. They gave up, apparently. I mean, they did nothing further on the application on top of Broadway either.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** They were great guns and then stopped, and then on this they stopped. So I have no idea. The technology's changed. It changes so quickly, who knows.

**Boardmember Cameron:** So what didn't they paint?

**Boardmember Dale:** The tower, the equipment that they have on the tower.

**Boardmember Cameron:** On Andrus?

**Boardmember Dale:** Yes, Andrus.

**Boardmember Cameron:** They never painted it?

**Boardmember Dale:** It has not been painted.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, we should go after them.

**Boardmember Dale:** It's still white.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I was going to say, Buddy, maybe you can make a note about that. They are supposed to paint the equipment that's on the Andrus building to blend.

**Boardmember Dale:** To match the brick.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes. And if they haven't done it, you can put that down as a follow-up. Because we were very strong about that.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, we were strong about that because they never painted the original one they put up there either.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You know, that was just el-cheapo. You know, 10 years later they never painted that, even though they promised in their application to do it then. I think if you read this stuff carefully, I think we said they can't use the new equipment until they paint it, or something like that. We should take a look at the minutes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** OK?

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** OK.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Great. So there's nothing there.

### 3. Wireless Service

**Chairperson Speranza:** We had spoken at length about the need to re-look at the personal wireless service facility overlay district, and we did meet. Jamie, you want to talk about what we were looking at, things we were thinking about, locations, now that we've got the map?

**Boardmember Cameron:** We should actually distribute the map to everybody here. We did actually find that there was actually more personal wireless overlay areas than at least I had been aware of. And that there is one which stretches all the way up the west side of Saw Mill River Road all the way out to Ravensdale. It goes all the way up there, and includes the parking lot of The Manor House.

And also, actually, Children's Village is an overlay zone. And also the bottom of Andrus Children's Home is an overlay zone, as well. And certainly as a location, the southern end of that parking lot at The Manor House would be an ideal place. And I don't know if they ever talked to them, or not.

And I think one of the issues is, you know, were they to talk to the people, how much are they willing to pay them to get a place to put it. And that may be part of our issue, when we hear from them, that they never heard from them or it didn't work out. It may be that they're shopping areas, and I think we should look at our law and see whether they can shop areas when they want to go out of our zone.

In other words, if they have to stay in our zone, even if it costs them a bit more than being out of our zone, we have a need, and an interest, in having them in our zone. And that's something you might think about.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, the law would cover that. The law says you have to show that it won't work in the zone. And not working doesn't mean it's going to cost a lot of money, not working right. It means physically it won't work. So you couldn't use that as an excuse to get around the law.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right. Well, the other thing that came up in the discussion we had was whether or not – and you might want to look at our law language – they would have to go to an adjacent town's overlay zone if the adjacent town would have them and if that would work.

It's not quite clear whether our law is broad enough for that. And personally, I think it would be nice to have it broad enough for that. So the person ... you know, if they could get into an

adjacent town's overlay zone – personal wireless zone – and it was available to them, they should go there rather than try to stay in our town. They should be able to put it in an area which is not a zone.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I see what you're saying.

**Boardmember Cameron:** And the language is just on edge. So I don't really want to hear your answer now because I think it was difficult anyway.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, you're right. And especially if there's another facility. You know, if there's a facility in Yonkers why do they feel that they need to have another facility in Hastings? Can't we say, "Well, why can't you look at locating on the facility that's nearby, even though it's in a different municipality"?

**Boardmember Cameron:** So certainly there is a lot of land very adjacent which, I would think – I'm not a scientist, of course – but very close to where they want to put the one up on Saw Mill River Road, which would work. Whether they really talked to the people or whether they've offered the people enough money to do it, I don't know.

You certainly can make a fair amount of money by agreeing to have a tower on your property. It's a good income-earner, from what I've seen and what we've discussed.

**Boardmember Dale:** And that land is in our right-of-way zone, where they could put a facility?

**Boardmember Cameron:** That parking lot is in our overlay zone.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I'll send the map.

**Boardmember Dale:** It is in an overlay zone.

**Boardmember Cameron:** That entire parking lot is an overlay zone.

**Boardmember Dale:** So really, based on your review, you don't think there's a need for additional overlay zones.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, I don't know.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, I think there may be a couple of additional properties that we would want to consider. But one of the things that we had also discussed with Fran and the Mayor was do we need technical expertise to help us with some of this.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right.

**Chairperson Speranza:** We're also waiting to hear as far as whether or not this building can hold any more. The initial report that we heard was no, it's full; structurally, you can't put anything more on this building. So we're gathering a lot of data to then organize and develop a strategy for moving forward with all of this.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right. And to give you an example on this building, if we do have a weight issue – and I don't know if we do or not, we're trying to find that out – it's a good notice to us; even though it's maybe not us. Maybe it's actually the Board of Trustees – when we agree on someone going on the building – that we force them to put in the lightest-weight equipment you can possibly have so we can use this building, which is an ideal location, for as many panels as possible. If you've got to put two tons up, and you can actually spend more money and only put one ton up, maybe we have an opportunity to have more towers.

And that's something to look at.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Could I just respond to Jamie's one question? No, actually it deals with that exact issue on showing necessity. This is, just to get a permit at all, you have to show that it's "*required to provide service to locations within the Village that the applicant is not able to serve*" ... oh, "*with existing facilities that are located within and outside the Village.*"

**Boardmember Cameron:** Boy, if it says "and outside" then it doesn't ...

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Outside. Yes, but that's existing outside so it clearly contemplates outside the Village. And then when you're looking to be outside it, you have to show that it's needed to provide coverage. So I think you could make an argument it's not needed here.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, that was the language I focused on. If they needed to provide coverage, one argument would be that it means that you don't have any other place you can do it, whether it's in- or outside.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I think that would be fair.

**Boardmember Cameron:** OK, but that's just something for you to focus on.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I just had a question. The first time I think I saw the personal overlay zone was in the application, and this was after having looked for it on the Village Web site. It's not in the zoning.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It is.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** No, I mean the actual map itself.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right, and we had trouble.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yes, we had trouble. We eventually got a map.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Because it's not in the zoning code, and Raf actually found it. And we've got to revise it. I mean, we've got to make this a little more permanent. You can tell it's just highlighted parcels.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** It would be nice to publicize it just so it's more available.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, and it should be in the code. It should be part of the code, for sure.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Yes.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I mean, the fact that those are our zones doesn't necessarily mean the owner of the property's agreed to have cell phone towers on it.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I concur.

**Chairperson Speranza:** We did not go out and approach them.

**Boardmember Cameron:** No.

**Chairperson Speranza:** In terms of the do you want your property to be included as part of the overlay zone.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** But it is legal.



**Chairperson Speranza:** The overlay zone was put in place, but to my recollection there was no outreach to the owners. And there doesn't need to be.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, only in the sense you don't need to outreach. But there was a public hearing on the overlay district. That's a zoning change.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right, when it was adopted.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** And then they would have had a chance to participate at that point.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I think a fair amount of the property that you're referring to is county-owned.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, it is.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** So even the parking lot they'd be referring to.

**Boardmember Cameron:** No. That parking lot is actually used by The Manor House.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** That's what I'm saying. It may be used by, but I think it's owned by ...

**Boardmember Cameron:** Oh, you think it's owned by the county?

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** I believe they purchased that from the county.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** They have?

**Boardmember Cameron:** I'd be surprised.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** We had looked into that area for the Comprehensive Plan, and I thank you for clarifying that. I was under the impression that the bulk of that was county-owned.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, what I didn't realize when I kept bringing it up at our meetings is that there was that house down the road. It's actually in our overlay zone. I knew it was county, but it's actually in our overlay zone.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** Well, that one county-owned house just north of Ravensdale, the county owned it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So as I said, we're continuing on looking at this. We'll get some more information, and progress to make some modifications.

Marianne, do you see any problem if we were to go ahead and recommend to the Board of Trustees, they then would make any modifications. Given the status of T-Mobile, at what point are they formally considered non-responsive?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** It doesn't matter.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It doesn't matter, OK. All right, that's good.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Absolutely not. In fact, you're actually expanding opportunities for them. But they can't hold you up.

**Chairperson Speranza:** OK.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I was going to say one more thing about the Andrus Children's Home property. The lower part of that property oversees what I'll call the Saw Mill River Valley. And yet it's a way away from all their buildings. So there is actually an opportunity, I think, to put a tower down there. Because as you go down the hill, they don't seem to use it at all. Maybe they do it for walking with children, but I don't know.

And there are a bunch of places outside of Hastings which would make good locations. Do other towns have personal overlay zones, do you know?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Oh, yes. This is very typical. I didn't write it; I adapted it for Hastings. A lot of municipalities were using it. I think Irvington had roughly the same. A lot of places have roughly the same zones.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, I think it would be very useful, as a member of the Planning Board, to have a copy of the map for Dobbs Ferry and Ardsley and Yonkers so we could actually get a view of what are the other places where somebody could put a tower. Particularly if they're coming here and they want to have – they need to have – a tower, they say, where we don't have an overlay zone. Whether it could be visible from someplace else.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I don't happen to know that the neighboring ones have it. For some reason I don't think Ardsley does.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Well, we can find out.

**Boardmember Cameron:** We could ask. It'd be nice.

#### 4. Municipal Planning Federation

**Chairperson Speranza:** As you know, we all received notice of the Municipal Planning Federation land use training classes that were going on last night, and then next Monday and Wednesday. Ms. Stecich, I know you're familiar with next Wednesday's session. You're going to be a panelist.

There was a very good session yesterday that Kathy and I were both in. Do you want to just talk a minute about what we heard? I mean, it goes towards the Comprehensive Plan, it goes towards what's been going on with the Conservation Commission. Not that we do a lot of the design work when applicants come before us, but certainly for Village projects, it gives some interesting tips.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** The keynote speaker the first night that started the session off was Dr. Karen Lee, the director of the Built Environment Program for the New York City Department of Health. In the last five years, she's been working with the American Institute of Architects, New York Chapter, as well as other design groups, to try to come up with ways to focus in on design and to try to combat what is considered not so much the infectious disease epidemics of the past – which zoning laws and sewer systems and aqueducts helped to cure, or not cure, but to prevent what are more common, diseases.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right. Not the infectious, the new chronic, diseases.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** The new chronic diseases that are more coming from not exercising as much, taking in too much food, not having access to fresh food, and not having necessarily the same level of physical exercise.

So what she presented were very, I won't say, small moves. They certainly weren't building new aqueducts. But it was a nice way to focus in on how to create environments both inside and outside buildings that people can feel a desire to take a stair or take a stroll or be in a public zone that's comfortable. I thought about a lot of small moves that Hastings could make that could potentially follow suit.

They found some very successful ways to help people improve their health, as well as sort of improve environments. I was fortunate to have heard the trainer that the Department of Health has hired to try to encourage people to adopt these things. From both speakers, I think, it's a very dynamic program.

The one thing that she talked about, that everybody at the session afterwards take stairs instead of elevators. So when you walk into a building, you see the elevator and you can't for the life of you find the stairs. Everyone, after hearing her speak, was looking for the stairs. They were a little embarrassed to take the elevator.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And it was difficult to find the stairs.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Darn difficult to find.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** A lot of government buildings, they're locked and you can't get out. The alarm's going to go off.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** That's how it is in the courthouse. I'm always afraid to go in the stairway because then I won't be able to get out.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And think of the wonderful stairs we have.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, a lot of office buildings, if you got in the stairwell on the 30th floor, you wouldn't be able to get out until you get to the ground.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's right. No access: "no reentry on this floor." All these ways that we prevent people from using them.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Well, I think the one thing that I thought, the Comprehensive Plan is under consideration by the Trustees. But I know one thing that people talked a lot about – and I was one of the two committee members that sort of focused in on this – was just circulation both for traffic and for pedestrians. But there is a real interest in people being able to walk to downtown, and have their kids walk to school.

I know, Eva, you've been very much a part of that in the past. But something I thought about, it was sort of ironic. I printed out the Hastings trailway map. But something I got somewhat passionate about through that process was figuring out a way to connect our existing trail system not with other trails, but with focusing on sidewalks and make those links.

So the trail map's very interesting, but there are like these discrete little pockets of trails. I looked at it, and saw there's only potentially a few sidewalks, a few areas, a few roadways that, if we focused in on them, we could really just sort of enliven our town in a way where you could leave your house, and say, "I'm going to go for a 45-minute walk in Hastings."

And we're very fortunate. We have the Aqueduct, which is so integrated and such a wonderful way. But anyway, that's the take-home I took home.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, we could connect the end of Burnside over to James Street to our park. That would be wonderful because then that whole area of town – where Bruce is over there – could actually funnel their way across and make it over to the school.

That sort of thing is really, I think, critical. That we figure out how to do, even if we have to try to raise money or something to get a right of way.

**Boardmember Alligood:** It occurs to me, in thinking a lot about the school walking issues, that sometimes also it's good to not allow progress that actually encourages more driving. So I think of the fact that over at Hillside there's not enough parking for parents who want to just visit the school. And the parking lot is for the teachers.

So in the years that I was going to visit Hillside, I always parked in the lot down the hill. And you are forced to walk up from the pool. And I know there was a proposal years ago that didn't go through to actually create a driving access from there up. And I'm glad that didn't go forward because a lot of kids got exercise, even if their parents picked them up but went to that lot. I mean, that's a nice little workout.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's true.

**Boardmember Alligood:** So, you know, we have to think creatively about how to encourage walking. Sometimes it's just saying this system actually is a good one. It's encouraging. We're not making it so you need to drive right up to the door that you want to go into.

**Boardmember Cameron:** A good drop-off point for the older kids. They could walk up that way.

Speaking about walking access to downtown, I did read something about the fact that the person who owns the 10 West Main lot was looking at putting in affordable housing there.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes. There was actually a community meeting.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I didn't attend it. I was just curious. How many units, do we know?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, it depends.

**Boardmember Dale:** It depends. There are two proposals on the table for now.

**Chairperson Speranza:** They were blocks on the property. There were six units in one, and up to 10 for the second one.

**Boardmember Dale:** In both proposals he made, they proposed keeping the existing building, which has four units in it – four two-bedroom apartments. And then building one that was sort of set back and left the parking in front of it, which had, I think, four units. There were two duplexes, or four duplexes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right, it was six and then one at grade level.

**Boardmember Dale:** And then the second proposal brought that square – which is just a schematic – forward to create a street line. And that actually had two more.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That had more.

**Boardmember Dale:** I think it had eight.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Or 10. That one might have been 10.

**Boardmember Dale:** Was it 10 – six plus four? I'm not sure, but it was a couple more units in that design than in the other design.

The man speaking is a consultant to the Fendt brothers, who actually own the property, who were Eric's former partners. And when Eric's company split, he created Urban Green and he and the two Fendts divided up the property that they owned mutually.

And this property was given to the Fendt brothers, who hired John Walters as a consultant to approach the Village and incorporate the Village's thinking as early as possible. He met with Sue initially, and Peter attended the meeting and basically recommended that he do that.

And since Meg had time available, that she would chair that meeting. The object was to invite the Village in to say, "What do you think, what are your issues? If we built on this site, particularly considering the history of what happened prior to this, what can we do that would avoid all those issues?" I think the meeting went very well.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I think they got a really good sense of what the concerns were. They knew that massing was a big concern for them. Their difficulty is providing the amount of parking that's required in addition to any kind of structure that's got units in it.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So that's something that they're thinking. That perhaps if it's affordable housing, given its location, maybe the Village would waive the parking or reduce the parking requirements. And then things could fit more suitably on the site, and you wouldn't have to have that ... and they kept describing the plateau area, and then the slope. And how much can you build on the plateau if you need parking and you need someplace for a structure.

So I think they got some good ideas, and they certainly got a sense of what the concerns were.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I think that's a great idea. And if it comes before us for just preliminary comment I would love to tell them that. Because I still feel that the other affordable housing project we have on Warburton – I don't know this for a fact, but it's possible – that there's more parking than it needed.

And I'm still curious about that. I'd love to see an after-study about whether we required too much parking.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You mean the one that's built.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Yes.

**Boardmember Dale:** Yes, the issue there is not so much that there's maybe more parking than is needed. It's that the people who live in the front of the building aren't necessarily using the parking space in the back of the building, but are rather parking on the street. And the intent was to make sure that they did not do that, but had their own spaces. That's the piece that doesn't seem to be working quite right.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I think probably because of potentially the stair connection from the higher parking lots. The stair's are uncovered, and at nighttime may be a little traumatic to get down.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Between the buildings, the units?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Between the buildings there's a stair that leads down to parking which is higher up. It always looked like it could potentially be not inviting at certain times.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I think what happens, someone is driving down the street and they see a parking spot. And they go around the building to just put their car there. Yes, that is what happens. Because I think we tested it with different weather conditions, whether it would be hard to walk up or down the steps. I think you wouldn't find any difference.

**Boardmember Dale:** I think it's by nature, though, in the intent.

**Boardmember Alligood:** But in any case, no matter what the situation is I still think that we want to live green, we want to encourage walkability. I think this may be a case where we really want to look whether our parking requirements are too stringent and actually run counter to our desire to have a more sustainable downtown.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Particularly at that location.

**Boardmember Dale:** The stair to the train is right there.

**Chairperson Speranza:** You're right in the downtown.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, that would be an interesting thing to do. To take a look at the people who live in our affordable units and see where they work, where they commute to. You may find that, actually, people who live in affordable units have a job that does not pay very much money. We know that. So they may not be working in New York City, and they may have to have a car to get to some job someplace.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That could be.

**Boardmember Cameron:** So a survey of the people in the building and where they work would be a wonderful first step.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Another thing I'd like to tag on to that, because it's something that came to my attention, was I think also looking at some of the assumptions on school children



that are living in various multi-family complexes in the Village, too, and understanding what assumptions might have been given, say, at Warburton.

I mean, how many children were projected to be living in that complex compared to what the school board knows.

(CROSS-TALK)

**Chairperson Speranza:** And I think that's something that can be done, I'm going to say, fairly easily. We've got nice stuff from the school.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Yes, the school can run an analysis of the addresses of the children in the district and they can easily tell you how many are in that.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Yes, they've reached out to me to share some information. And I think it's just as we talk about potential other things you could see, quote, unquote, reviews that I think should be one other one as well. And not to try to preclude anything, but at least understand what the ratio, what that percentage, is in Hastings.

Because it is very localized. I mean, you can take a state-wide one, or a region-wide, or county-wide, it's different to what's in Hastings. And that's why I didn't say "affordable." We can look at other multi-family, as well. Just see how many children reside in the town over the last how many years.

## 5. Affordable Housing

**Chairperson Speranza:** I just had one other thing that I was curious about because I haven't been following the Zoning Board meetings: the affordable housing projects.

**Boardmember Dale:** Still has an issue. Mt. Hope has a problem. It's going back, and is in the next coming Zoning Board meeting. The Board has been questioning ... it asked for four variances. The variance that's caused the most trouble has been the setback. Interesting to hear that on Nichols Drive it's 8 feet.

We started out with a 9-foot setback, and the Board did not like that. It eventually got pushed to 15 feet. A lot of the houses on the existing block are not within the 30 feet, and they vary anywhere from 15 to 25 feet setbacks.

Another issue was concern about the height of the building, since in two-dimensional drawings in a section it shows as straight, almost a three-story rise. But in reality, the accessory unit is in front and it sets back. And then it's two stories above that, which is the main house. So there's a disagreement about whether the building is out of character and looms onto the street.

There was a concern about the parking, and one of the solutions was to grant a waiver so that they would require less parking so they wouldn't have to park as many spaces. The garage, the sort of minimum requirement was for three cars and whether or not there would be a garage that would sit right on the property line.

And somewhat concerned about the right of way in front of the property, which belongs to the Village, and whether if you grant the right for them to use that as a parking space does that have to be granted to everybody on the block. Clearly, most of the neighbors are already using it. In fact, one of them is some sort of mechanic and he has six or seven cars parked in front of his house all the time.

So I found a lot of the comments, that the Village people who protested the project, the neighbors, were somewhat disingenuous in their arguments. But we're going back, Sue is going back, this next Board meeting with an amendment that they had asked for.

I suggested to them they do some sort of a three-dimensional presentation, which would clarify the relationship of this building to the environment that it's being put into, and whether or not it stands out or it's out of character, which seemed to be of concern to the Zoning Board.

There will be a memo argued on the advocacy side which basically argues that the zoning regulations, on this block particularly, were imposed after the fact. The houses preexisted the zoning legislation, there's an overlay that's being put on it, and the house that's proposed is not consistent with the zoning.

But the Mount Laurel suit many years ago, in the '60s, was used to tarnish the reputations of a lot of villages because they used their zoning legislation to prevent diversity and to prevent the creation of affordable housing. It would be a mistake to allow our zoning again to prevent affordable housing from being built, particularly since it's so difficult to find sites in the Village to accommodate affordable housing.

Our requirement is 100; we've built 18 in 10 years. And there's a settlement on the lawsuit that we're being asked to comply with, and Hastings has been named as one of the villages that needs to address the issue. So I think there's an urgency that the Zoning Board should

consider that goes beyond whether or not a setback should be 8 feet or 15 feet, or the issues that they're raising.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I was just going to say that it's a really divided Board. I mean, it was already voted down once. The first proposal, they voted it down. And then they came back with a revised proposal. I think at the last meeting it was the applicants who asked to put the vote off.

**Boardmember Dale:** Well, there wasn't a full board. There were four of them.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, there wasn't a full board.

**Boardmember Dale:** And you very fairly warned us that. Two-to-two is a no.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Right. So it's very close on the Board. And what I saw at the last meeting was really a Hobb's tour as you go through the difficult choice to make in what your presentation is going to be.

Because two of the Zoning Board members prefer to have, rather than a garage, a parking area that would be surrounded by a stone wall. And you can only vote for the proposal if it were an open parking space. They didn't like the garage. And then two others really preferred a garage. They didn't like the open parking space. So it was really difficult.

I tell you, I wouldn't put money on it. It's very difficult.

**Boardmember Dale:** In fact, the strategy would include that if they do vote no that we're going to go right back with a proposal for a single house. Because the reality is, if we can't build on that site, if we can't build this project, we can't build the other project.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's what I was wondering.

**Boardmember Dale:** The issue really is cost. Since we're buying the other site, the cost of that has to be spread over three or four units, preferably four units. If not, then we may not be able to build the two units. So it really is a cost issue, and I would hate to see a consideration of whether it should be a garage or a parking area block four units from being built in the Village.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So at some point we're hoping it'll come back to us in some way, shape, or form.

**Boardmember Dale:** Yes, whichever hurdle it gets over.

**Chairperson Speranza:** In some form.

**Boardmember Dale:** It will then come back to the Planning Board.

## 6. Miscellaneous

**Chairperson Speranza:** I had two other things, not to go into detail, but I don't want to lose track of: the application forms, which we spoke a tiny bit about last night in terms of just carrying it through. And now that Buddy's on staff, we'll bring this up again and maybe sit down with you and Deven and figure out how they could be improved and clarified. And make sure that the information that we get at our meetings is clear and concise.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I think also Jamie talked about there had been past history wanting a checklist of some type.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's the other thing I have here: the development review checklist.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** So I think they're kind of together. I would see them that way.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, that's a very good point.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** So you can make sure that what's in the code is on the checklist, therefore is on the application and updated as need be.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, and gets on the application so that people are not surprised.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I want to mention one thing, Patty. I know you went back to the Westchester Planning Federation. We didn't see each other because you went to the first session and I went to the second. But it was interesting, there was a small session on SEQRA and the sort of changes that are coming up.

And it was interesting. There's going to be some changes to the SEQRA form, one of which involved lengthening both the long and the short form to some degree. But also taking into account some other considerations, one of them being climate change. I don't know, I came in a little late. Do you know when that's coming in?

**Chairperson Speranza:** No, they don't know. It's going through review right now. Have you heard anything about this?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I would hope.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Oh, gosh, the long form is going to be 12 pages I think they said, and the short form is now going to be six pages.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes. Well, the short form is useless, truth be known.

**Chairperson Speranza:** You might as well do the long form.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, no, it just doesn't provide enough information. I mean, they've never revised those forms from when they first came out, whatever, about 20-some years ago.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I mention it only because as we talk about a process it'd be nice. One thing that I learned, and I'm new in learning, but one of the things they were talking about is you can start off with the short form. But as you get into it, you can ask the applicant to go to a long form.

For me, I kind of need to know what are the criteria that you feel might be required. Because I've seen some short forms come across on the applicants in the few months I've been on the Board, and they make sense. You know, they're not huge-impact projects.

But you know, I need to get a sensitivity. And it sounds like there may be some way we can talk about integrating that into a checklist as well, and understanding what might be best in what situation.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right. And that's driven by whatever the kind of action it is, the type one, the type two.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You just reminded me of something. You know, we had a bit of rain a couple weeks ago.

**Boardmember Alligood:** We did, didn't we.

**Boardmember Cameron:** And one of the things that occurred to me as I was driving across Ravensdale, looking at the Saw Mill River Parkway almost up to the center guardrail top, the first thing it reminded me of is the last time that happened about 50 years ago. My wife and I

paddled our canoe straight down Saw Mill River Parkway and up Farragut Parkway as far as the sign.

But anyway, it occurred to me – and I was going to call the Building Department – I think we should go over and check certain properties, and you know which one I'm talking about, to see how high the water is then. I just kick myself for not doing it, but to go over there and actually see how high the water comes up.

Because I notice, in one of the green codes that we were looking at, they actually had ... their code applied. For the height of flooding, they acquired the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers prediction plus a certain percentage. They add a certain percentage to the top of that, on the theory that whatever it is now, 50 years from now – when some poor owner owns the house and the builder doesn't own it anymore – it's going to be higher.

So I think we should be alert for opportunities. I hate to say that a rainstorm is an opportunity, but to go out and take a look and see how it's affecting our town.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** That's an important thing. Thank you for mentioning that.

**Boardmember Dale:** I drove over the Ravensdale bridge that night, as well. It took me three hours to get home from the city.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Because you drove.

**Boardmember Dale:** True. No, I had to pick my daughter up. It was her birthday and she had a party. I had a carload of kids, and it took us three hours to get back because traffic in the city was totally blocked by Westchester traffic. They couldn't get where they were going.

On Saw Mill River Parkway they made you get off at Tarrytown – I'm sorry, Tuckahoe Road – and then come up. So the Saw Mill River Parkway was under water entirely. I am convinced that site was covered pretty high up the Saw Mill.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, I just remembered the name of a road when I was trying to drive out the next day. I remembered Ridge Road, and I went across Ravensdale and got up on Ridge Road and rode it all the way north. It was good.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Does anyone have anything else to bring up this evening?

**Boardmember Dale:** Do we have anything to say about what's going on in Dobbs Ferry with that proposal that was packed into our packet?

**Chairperson Speranza:** We can weigh in on it. Right now it's the environmental process that's started, right? Wasn't that the lead agency notice? They haven't actually started. I mean, the application has been made. Can we have something to say? Absolutely.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, it's interesting. You know, that gym up there is very popular. But somebody reminded me the other day that they always thought of Saw Mill River Parkway as a parkway, and that was the first building they saw that made it so it wasn't like a parkway anymore. You know, I just thought that was a very interesting observation.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right. Because it's commercial.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You know, it lost its parkway appearance. Otherwise, you'd think you were on a parkway.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And, of course, Akzo was so low.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yes, the commercial buildings on the east side were so low.

**Chairperson Speranza:** We can weigh in on it. We could do it as the Planning Board. We could make a recommendation to the Board.

**Boardmember Dale:** As I gather from reading our local newspaper, there's another project.

**Chairperson Speranza:** In Yonkers.

**Boardmember Dale:** On top of Ridge Hill. I don't know if anybody's got an update yet. The road was open, so I drove up and the guy told me I couldn't go in. But it's huge, it's unbelievably huge. If you start to add up all the traffic, there was an article that I read a number of years ago called "Creating the Edge City."

And the concept was, all these people have moved to the suburban environment in order to avoid problems of traffic and noise in the city. And they end up spending literally hours in traffic jams in places like Jackson Avenue because this road system does not accommodate anywhere near the level of traffic that all this overbuilding, the scale, had created.

It's not just overbuilding, but it's overbuilding things that generate huge amounts of traffic. And it will change completely the quality of life of this whole region if all those projects get built.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And we can certainly go on the record. I would imagine that Dobbs Ferry is going to have the applicant take all of that into consideration when they do the environmental review. The Yonkers project I'm not so familiar with in terms of what the status is now. But that's certainly something that we can check as far as where in the process they are.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I have also read a little bit, just an article, something in the *Enterprise* about the Mayor's meeting to talk about projects. I was very interested in that. Do you want me to try to have a focus discussion at our next meeting?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Sure, we can do that. About that nearby development?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I think so, yes.

**Boardmember Dale:** Just the impact on our Village is going to be huge, even if none of it is actually within our boundaries.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** It would be useful. You know, we have the Dobbs Ferry, but maybe even like a Google map or something that just sort of pointed out where these are at. I'd be happy to do that, but I'd have to know a little bit more about where the projects are.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Is this in the Ardsley, or the Dobbs Ferry, school district?

**Boardmember Dale:** Ardsley.

**Boardmember Cameron:** So they're going to speak up.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I can say that even if there weren't this issue of other projects coming down the pike in the area I think this project completely oversaturates that piece of land. And I think it had a use there that I actually remarked a couple years ago was nicely sited on the property. Obviously, it had a much lower impact because it was a commercial space.

I think obviously it's not under our jurisdiction, but from a planning perspective it makes sense to try to utilize what's there in a more sustainable and kind of a smart way. And this project is exactly the opposite. They want to tear it all down. In terms of green, it is the opposite direction we want to go in.



We've talked about this a lot, where we can be environmentally conscious or think green around existing buildings. And to not even consider adapting those buildings, which I think actually have some potential, is crazy.

**Boardmember Dale:** And the hard part about this particular one, I think, is that there's a lot of incentive for Dobbs Ferry to approve it because of the tax base. And yet the impact is going to be on Ardsley and on the Saw Mill River Parkway, but not on Dobbs.

**Boardmember Cameron:** And they haven't left any space for the cloverleaf they need.

(LAUGHTER)

**Boardmember Sullivan:** One thing I was curious about – because I know Dobbs has just recently adopted a new zoning code, and it went quickly to the Web site – I read about this Chauncy Park zone. That's just what they happen to call it. That was an unusual kind of zoning, and they approached them on kind of a neighborhood basis. Quickly looking at this, quickly reviewing the code, they kind of got what they asked for.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Oh, is that right?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Well, based on uses. I'm curious about ... and I didn't really delve into bulk and lot coverage and parking, but it's kind of like WOW. I'm curious, just kind of as a neighbor, to see how they follow ... how many variances are they looking for to do this, if any. I mean, I'm not judging that, but they call for this kind of use in that area.

I agree with you about the bulk. I think of having driven over to the Underdome, which is a sport facility, Bed Bath & Beyond, and Target, and a huge grocery store. I just had the sense this is going to be very high façade, with structured parking, really, really different visually. And that Jamie's point's well taken: it would change the character of the parkway dramatically.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Not to speak of, I think, a huge impact up and down the Saw Mill. Because right now, already, the drive up the Saw Mill, or down, is impacted by the creation of this new building with the gym and the other businesses. I think, from my perspective, using that gym is still OK.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I think you're both conflicted.

**Boardmember Alligood:** But I think that given the uses they're proposing, and the density, I just can't imagine what's going to happen. How long are you going to have to wait to let all

the traffic in the road. And the lines that'll be created on either side of the parkway to just get on and off, it's mind boggling.

**Boardmember Dale:** Jamie's right. I need a cloverleaf there.

**Boardmember Cameron:** The parkway cannot accommodate it.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Not the way it's packed. And the speeds that people drive on a road that was not designed for those speeds.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, Elizabeth Seton has built this perfectly enormous pediatric center up on Executive Boulevard. You want to talk about a big building, it's an absolutely enormous building. As you go up Executive Boulevard towards the parkway, if you swing off to your right it's up on top of that hill. It's absolutely enormous.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I haven't noticed it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** OK, we'll see what else. Hopefully, we won't have a big agenda and will have time to be able to talk about this. That'd be great.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**