

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
JANUARY 16, 2014**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, January 16, 2014 at 8:15 p.m. in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

PRESENT: Chairman James Cameron, Boardmember Eva Alligood, Boardmember Michael Ambrozek, Boardmember Kerry Gould-Schmit, Boardmember William O'Reilly, Boardmember Rebecca Strutton, Boardmember Kathleen Sullivan, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Deputy Building Inspector Charles Minozzi

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of November 21, 2013

Chairman Cameron: I have a question to ask my lawyer for that time. We had four people at the meeting, one of whom is not here.

Village Attorney Stecich: You can't approve them.

Chairman Cameron: Well, we're going to have to if we're going to have to invite Rhoda Barr back to a meeting. Because there's only four people who were there, so we potentially won't have ...

Village Attorney Stecich: Well, the only thing I would say is, one other person can listen to the minutes and approve them based on what they heard. I don't know if anybody who wasn't at the meeting happened to listen to the meeting.

Boardmember Sullivan: No.

[laughter]

I read through them.

Chairman Cameron: That's all right.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know what?

Chairman Cameron: We'll fix that.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, we'll fix it later.

Meeting of December 19, 2013

Chairman Cameron: So we're going to move on to the December minutes. First, I would ask if anybody has any changes or additions to the minutes.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Wasn't here.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I have not had an opportunity to review the minutes.

Chairman Cameron: This is actually the November minutes.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Oh, the November minutes. I have no comments.

Chairman Cameron: I said it backwards earlier, not surprisingly.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I *was* here.

Chairman Cameron: Anybody have any comments on the November minutes?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Jamie, are we talking about the November or the December minutes?

Chairman Cameron: Oh, I'm sorry. We are talking about the November. The December minutes, we only had four people. It's just that I said it backwards.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: So are we going to postpone that 'til next month, November?

Chairman Cameron: We will have a guest appearance by Rhoda.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: We can ask her to come if you want to.

Village Attorney Stecich: Let me look into this, see if there's some way around it.

Chairman Cameron: Anyway, we're only running one month behind. Do I have any comments from anybody on the minutes?

On MOTION of Boardmember O'Reilly, SECONDED by Boardmember Ambrozek with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of December 19, 2013 were approved as presented.

III. ELECTION OF PLANNING BOARD CHAIRMAN

Chairman Cameron: The next item on our agenda, actually, is our annual election of a chairman of the Planning Board. We do this every year at the first meeting, and the Trustees gave us the joy of self-inflicting it on whoever one of us they wish to do so. Any nominations?

Boardmember O'Reilly: I nominate James Cameron.

Boardmember Alligood: You beat me to it.

Chairman Cameron: Any other nominations? Anybody like to make a motion?

On MOTION of Boardmember O'Reilly, SECONDED by Boardmember Ambrozek with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board approved the appointment of James Cameron as Planning Board Chairman for another term.

Chairman Cameron: I abstain. I'm opposed.

[laughter]

Boardmember O'Reilly: The Chairman accepts.

Boardmember Sullivan: Thank you, Jamie.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes, thank you very much.

IV. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Site Plan Approval – Application of Tony Dos Ries to legalize previously-constructed additions and alterations to an existing multi-use building at 524 Warburton Avenue. Said property is in the CC Zoning district and is known as SBL 4.70-50-11 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairman Cameron: We have an item on our agenda. We're going to take these very, very slightly out of order. We're going to do the application – because it's such a short one – of Tony Dos Ries to legalize previously-constructed additions and alterations to an existing multi-use building at 524 Warburton Avenue, otherwise known as Tony's Restaurant. Part of the reason we're doing this is because you were so patient and sat with us until midnight a few months ago while we wrestled with other things.

Mr. Koch, architect for applicant: I'm here on behalf of Tony and Maria. I have to say I'm a regular at this restaurant, one of my best-kept secrets. They've asked me to represent them to legalize some work that Tony did on the restaurant subsequent to buying it. In addition, I believe there was some nonconforming work that was done before he bought it, and he just bought it as-is.

To review that work, basically everything involves the rear yard setback. There is a part of the previously existing extension to the kitchen that falls within the 10-foot rear yard required setback. In addition to the little addition to the kitchen, Tony constructed a storage shed in the back.

Chairman Cameron: (Inaudible).

Mr. Koch: No, that's something else. This is at street level on the north side of the property, right in the corner, abutting Chelsea's Closet, which is next door.

In addition to that, there is a previously-existing and allowed street-level enclosure which originally was a deck and became the dining room of Tony's many years back. Below it, he actually constructed a deck which sits within the same envelope as the deck above. Part of that deck is enclosed, and that enclosure falls within the rear yard setback.

So that's the work. It's the enclosure below grade on the deck and that little bit of storage area on the northeast corner of the property. We're here because it sits within the rear yard setback.

Chairman Cameron: Does anybody ...

Village Attorney Stecich: No, that's not why you're here. You're here because you need site plan approval. You have to go to the Zoning Board ...

[cross-talk]

Mr. Koch: Yes, that's right. Absolutely right.

Village Attorney Stecich: ... for the thing. So if the Board does approve this, it has to be subject to them getting the variances.

Mr. Koch: Thank you.

Boardmember Sullivan: Wasn't there view preservation?

Chairman Cameron: Yes, I was going to bring that up, actually. They also had a view preservation issue, but pursuant to our new procedure I actually went and looked at it and didn't see any way you could even get a glimpse of ... anybody could look over your shoulder and get a glimpse of the river from where these items were added (sic). So this was the conclusion of the Building Department and was confirmed by both the chairman of the ZBA and by me on behalf of the Planning Board. That was done in December.

Mr. Koch: Right. Then, additionally, if you reviewed those photographs that we took, we couldn't get a view of it that was blocked by the addition.

Chairman Cameron: Right. I was going to put it in the minutes at the end of this meeting. Then I will do that for another one. So does anybody have any comments on this? Anybody here in the audience would like to speak to this? OK.

Hearing nothing, I can entertain a motion that we give site plan approval to Tony Dos Ries to legalize previously-constructed additions and alterations to an existing multi-use building at 524 Warburton Avenue, subject to him obtaining the required variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

On MOTION of Boardmember O'Reilly, SECONDED by Boardmember Sullivan with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board approved the site plan to legalize previously-constructed additions and alterations to an existing multi-use building at 524 Warburton Avenue, contingent on the granting of the required variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you very much.

Mr. Koch: Thank you very much. I want to extend a special thank you to Charles Minozzi for his help.

V. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **View Preservation and Site Plan Approval – Application of CCI Properties Inc. for View Preservation and Site Plan approval for the construction/addition of a new nine-dwelling-unit building in place of an existing two-family dwelling at 32-34 Washington Avenue. Said property is in the MR-1.5 Zoning District and is known as SBL 4.70-53-11 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairman Cameron: So now we move to view preservation and site plan approval with regard to an application by CCI Properties Inc. for View Preservation and Site Plan approval for the construction/addition of a new nine-dwelling-unit building in place of an existing two-family dwelling.

Lino Sciarretta, representing the applicant: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. The last time we were here we were with an entirely different plan. I'm here tonight with our project team, Kim Martelli and [Jay Bucanower] XXX. And added to the team, we have John Meyer Consulting, specifically Jim Ryan and Mr. Anthony Nester, who we added because we basically reconfigured this project.

Just by way of background, we're talking here about 32-34 Washington Avenue. This is the present site right here. You will recall we were here for a proposed site plan which combined the existing structure – which is on Washington, which is an existing two-family structure – and adding to it another structure that was going to be facing on Warburton Avenue. So we were at a three-story building at the time, with 13 dwelling units. We were before your board a couple of times, we heard your comments. We also heard the comments of the community. We also went to the Zoning Board for an interpretation with respect to the coverage issue because we had a significant coverage issue with respect to the original proposal, due to its bulk. Again, we were talking about a three-story, 13-unit structure at the time.

After hearing your comments and that of the Zoning Board, we also had a community meeting in the Village of Hastings at the Community Center on December 18. We also heard some more comments. Based on that, we've developed a new reconfigured site. We also now are coming in for subdivision approval – if you can give me the next board, Anthony. Previously we were using the entire site. We were using an existing structure, and adding to it another structure. Now, what we're doing – again, based on what we heard here, the Zoning Board, and the community – on Washington Avenue there was a lot of comment with respect to maintaining the existing structure, which was, I believe, formerly an old convent many years ago. We are doing that. In doing so, now we're going to be subdividing this parcel out and creating a new lot with the new proposed structure.

This new proposed structure, which Mr. Ryan will get into, is now seven units, and we've gone from three stories to two. What we've done is, we've maintained the character and the look of the existing structure, with some minor alterations which Jim Will get into, and we're creating a new lot with a new structure on this site. We still have an issue with coverage – we're going to need a variance for that – but the variance, we believe, is less so given where we were back earlier last year to where we are now.

So without further adieu, I'm going to have Jim Ryan from John Meyer Consulting go through the details of the new project. Thank you.

Jim Ryan, John Meyer Consulting: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Board. Thank you for hearing this application tonight.

As Attorney Sciarretta has indicated, we've come in and tried to take a fresh look at this. We've had the benefit of seeing the record that was established for this application when it first came in. We also were involved with a community meeting, too, where we were trying to get a little more input as to what the concerns were, particularly with immediate abutters. I think what was clear to us is that we thought the plan could do much better, and it could do much better with a reduced density right off the bat. I think the character on Washington was an important aspect and high priority in terms of the concerns we heard from the neighbors in the neighborhood.

We think that we can slightly improve that property, the landscape on that property. A lot of the trees were overgrown and so on. But I think our sense of it was, let's re-look at the plan to try to preserve not only the character along the Washington frontage, but also as you turn the corner onto Warburton, too. We had suggested that it may be better not to do anything with that existing building; let's try to, essentially, spruce that up. Not only preserve the character, but enhance that. And we can do that with landscaping and some very practical changes to that. In dealing with that building, too, we were able to discern some of the concerns of the immediate neighbor with regard to the adequacy of the parking in the driveway. I think our plan is an attempt to try and deal with those issues, too. And there may be others, too. We're open to continued discussions on improvements we can make.

But by and large, the priority for us was let's look at preserving that character of that building. It would remain as a two-family residence, again, with some upgrades, landscaping, so on, which we'll continue to develop. Once we did that, we were looking at potential subdivision of the property. What was then thereafter important to us is try to limit the amount of impervious area on the property. We thought the real practical approach was to try and preserve the site in terms of the normal gradients there and see if we can establish a situation where we can completely enclose the parking area. Essentially, the building we're going to show you tonight is a two-story building from the visual aspect out on Warburton. There's an existing wall along the frontage of the property.

Village Attorney Stecich: Excuse me. We can't see it.

Mr. Ryan: I'm sorry.

Village Attorney Stecich: Is it possible to raise that up?

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, I think so. Hold on.

Boardmember Alligood: All right, yeah. Now we can see it. Thank you.

Mr. Ryan: See if that works. That's important because most of what we're talking about is along that frontage, too. Is that better?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah.

Mr. Ryan: OK. All right, so along Warburton Avenue the natural grade is really preserved by the wall. The building essentially ... or the property lifts up at that point. So we thought let's see if we can work with the grade and see if the natural grade would allow us to essentially create a parking structure, putting all the parking below the building. When we did that, we were able to establish what we thought was a reasonable square footage. And all the parking worked. Again, one of the issues we were hearing was the concern over the parking in this property. So what we've done here is, we've put together a plan which is a proposal for a seven-unit building – again, a big decrease from what they were looking at before – with all of the parking created underneath the building.

So we have – I believe, Anthony – it's 13 parking spaces and seven units proposed for that. We have a provision for handicapped parking, as well. Now, what we're also going to show you tonight is what we thought was important because the character key – and Kim Martelli will talk a little bit about it, as well – is how we do this. So we're going to show you a very quick video simulation of what that looks like. We went to great lengths to not only look at this site, look at the existing building out on Washington, but also look at the character of the neighborhood and try to see if we can come up with some kind of a design, I think, that addressed a lot of the issues with regard to its proximity to other properties here. So we'll show you that in just a minute.

Other aspects of the design we're dealing with is preservation of views. I'll show you in a simulation; we'll talk a little bit about that – and Kim will talk about that, as well – the other aspects of the design relating to logistics and the technical aspects. We'll just show you very quickly how we're grading this property off and how we're providing for utilities. We know that in any project we work on, Westchester County -- or actually in the region, for that matter – we have to deal with stormwater. The grades allow us to create a situation where we could provide for on-site detention so we don't add to any burdens on existing utilities. Utilities are available to the property, and with this design in this building it worked out quite well. The building sits nicely on the property in terms of the grading in the back. So we limit the grading along the back portion of the property – creates some flat areas that are usable open space for the people who reside here.

We're looking at a grand entrance, which we'll show you, and I think it'll be even clearer when you see it from the perspective views. The sides grade in quite nice. There are existing retaining walls on this property. A very, very key element of our design is to preserve not only retaining walls that are along the frontage of the property in terms of the character, but there's also some walls that are remnants of an existing foundation that's there. They're in good shape structurally, they work well. So we're working that, too, to provide for adequate open space for the residents of the facility.

So, Anthony, if you can go to the renderings – because I think that's probably one of the more important ones here – I'll let Kim talk a little bit about that. The entrance to the property, again, we see as part of preservation. The lower view that you're seeing here is the building. This wall, although it will have to be enhanced slightly in terms of elevating it slightly as it comes down to the corner of the property, we're looking at, really, a grand entrance here to the building. You can see it from the front. You can see that there are stairs that are used to access along the front. But again, the natural grade wants the building to be up at this elevation here. And essentially, you're driving in the driveway and driving into an open parking area; again, 13 parking spaces, which exceed the code requirement.

Again, the back of the building, as it grades out there is a new retaining wall just as you get to the edge of the property. And then it flattens out in the back so we can limit disturbance and impact on the neighbors. If you recall, this is the entrance in the corner here coming into the parking garage. And this elevation is a true elevation of this area; comes out to a natural grade here, with a flat terrain. And then this accesses, I believe – three units, Kim? – four units in the back. So we have access to the building from both the front and the back. Again, this is just only to show you – and it'll show you in the video, as well – that this is the existing building we're trying to, again, enhance, maintain and, where possible, enhance the character of this frontage here. But in the background – it's a little dark, but you'll be able to see it in the video that we'll show – you see that building here.

Again, I think what's going to be important here is try to keep the massing, the bulk, of that building in character with the surrounding buildings that are there. That's why we decided that we're not going to go to three-story. Essentially, when you look at the grades that are out there, we're going to limit that to two-story. And then Kim will talk a little bit about the roofline, too, so we can make that building even shorter, essentially. It's actually going to end up less than the height of the existing building that's there as well as the building on the other side.

So, Kim, you want to talk a little bit about the architecture?

Kim Martelli, KTM Architect: [off-mic]. As Jim gave you a little prelude of the plans, we're talking about seven dwelling units. One of the significant differences in this building is that not only have we reduced the stories from a basement garage area to two floors, but we've changed the unit styles to be more of a purchasers market. We're looking at duplexes in all these dwelling units. On the front side of the building, the upper right-hand corner, is the second floor, and the ground floor is below it. Each of these units has a ground floor entry living area, a second-floor bedroom/bathroom space. On the front side of the building we have three 3-bedroom units, the largest being really designed like a center-hall Colonial. You have a true dining area, a true living space, a kitchen to a family room style; a really generous footprint for that floorplan. And above it, three true bedrooms. We're creating a real master suite on the second floor, a hall bath for the second and third bedrooms. And with excellent views out the front onto Warburton.

Each of the two corner dwelling units has three bedrooms, as well. We're designing these as one of the bedrooms downstairs to allow for either an in-law suite or an older child to be in. And it has a full bath downstairs, as well. On the second floor, two bedrooms and an open loft area. The two corner back units are also a similar style to the two front corner except they're true two-bedroom units. They have a slightly larger living space downstairs with a true dining area and a great open living room. All these spaces open to an open kitchen plan, all with a straight-run stair up to the second floors.

The two center back units – type A, that's the green-colored units – are one-bedrooms. Of the seven dwelling units, these are the only two without direct views to the river. But we're affording the greater number of units, five of the seven, with direct either side or front views toward the river. So really, the "C" that wraps around the building has both a combination of front and side views out to the river now, where we can afford them, from the bedrooms as well as the living spaces.

As Jim had indicated, we have ground floor parking which is relatively below grade. I'll do a little walk-through of the section to show you where we kind of get [buried] in the front and the back. From those 13 parking spaces, naturally the residences with access on the rear of the building will gravitate toward these parking spaces, up a set of stairs and into an open walkway on the back side of the structure, giving them access to these four living area doors. Residents on the front will find their way to a stairwell that's sculpted into the existing grade and walks them up to entry porches, entry terraces, on the front of the building. That's what creates that great residential look and residential scale on Warburton.

I will show you it in section, as well, but we're looking at, ultimately, a flat roof above these two stories with a small false parapet to conceal any penetrations through that roof.

[Male Voice]: [off-mic].

Ms. Martelli: Right. You've seen from previous submissions, our section graphic is to illustrate how height is identified in Hastings zoning. But more importantly, you'll see this ground floor garage, as cut, just past the edge of where that walkway comes out, is ultimately fully buried even at Warburton. Our grade at the front will drop down a little bit so that existing retaining wall, that stone retaining wall, will marry with the existing adjacent. But for all intents and purposes, that front of the garage is completely buried, as is the back side. So, really, our only open façade ends up being on that south side. We have a great opening for that 25-foot wide driveway. Then we're also opening the wall and just using a little bit of aluminum rails to just close views into that space. I think the first perspectives are good, and helpful.

That gives you kind of a great view of coming into that driveway. You'll see we've got the opening to the drives and we've got some rails, again keeping it a relatively open side to that drive area. Here, in fact, is that stair that brings residents in the front up a set of stairs about two-thirds of the way up to their residences. Much like brownstones, each unit has a generous stoop outside and a sitting area. In addition to creating some of that green outdoor space, each of the dwelling units on the front has its own terrace, as well. Then we've worked in some small balconette and Juliette balconies to enhance those doorways that open to the river views. You really see them as these little box bays, where we've pulled in the materials from the existing adjacent building and brought brick both at the base up through these box bays, as well. They continue around the perimeter of the building and find themselves once again at the back side and the center entrances

We're looking at the remainder of the materials to be Hardiplank cementitious siding. Again, lap siding, with cementitious corner boards, as well. The roofing is a false parapet, in that it's only 5 feet high from the fascia to the tip of that mansard. It would be asphalt roof shingles. Then we're looking at the windows and doors to be fiberglass. A lot of those door styles are French doors to maximize the light and views outside.

I think we could possibly do a little walkaround.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, the only thing that I would mention is that the height – although permitted three stories of 40 feet – we’re looking, designed, at two stories and 26 feet. Again, in part, it was a recognition of where the neighbors’ properties are positioned to deal with the view concerns that were expressed about the views through, and by, this Building 2. We didn’t need the height, quite frankly. The false roof with the parapet essentially allows us a place for mechanical units, too. So we’ve used this quite effectively. It still gives a residential character. But it also mitigates the impacts associated with the multi-family because of the need for condenser units, and so on. We can put them on the rooftop of the building.

With the Chair’s permission, we have a very short video. It’s a simulation that we’re using quite often now to talk about the character. We’ll just run you through that. We’re going to let it run. It’s about 50 seconds for the first one, then we’ll slow it down in case there’s any questions. We can point out some features of the property. The intent, as Anthony’s putting it up, is to now marry the design into the character of the area. What you’ll see when it comes up, too, is that we did our best to model the massing of the adjacent buildings. These are buildings across the road on Washington, across the road on Warburton. All of those buildings, again, we didn’t apply texture to all those buildings, but we tried to get the massing right. The grades are true grades so they are either survey grades or grades that we got from Westchester County. So the accuracy here, it’s not just what I’d call a “cartoon figure.” These are real models done with current 3-D technology. So it should give you a real close feel of how this building’s going to tie in with the neighboring properties.

Ms. Martelli: [off-mic] the lights.

Mr. Ryan: So again, we’re going to let it run. That [roof] on the right-hand side is our building. You get a glimpse of the parking garage and the frontage to the building. Again, the wall – the texture in the wall – will end up being a little built up on the front portion on the right side. But we’re running by this property. There is curbside parking, existing parking. We’re on Warburton, and we’re approaching the intersection to Washington, too.

As we turn the corner, we tried to get the correct massing of the trees on the right-hand side that protect those trees. They’re a little bit overgrown and, as a landscape architect, I think we can do some enhancement and trimming. That being the existing building on Washington, you get a slight glimpse of the building from the back. We’ll get another glimpse of that as we come back. And then we’re going to turn into the site. But again, preservation of this, enhancement – you see the gas station across the street, again just to put it in perspective. OK, we’re on Warburton, approaching the intersection of Washington. Again, just for reference, we have the Getty station on the right, commercial use, our use, and our building on the left-hand side. We’re approaching our building on the left.

Most of the existing building is screened because of the dense vegetation. Again, a bit overgrown but trying to give you a sense of the character of the building. We try to tie in the brick so it gives you a sense of connection to the existing building, but it's really separate. As we come into the property here, underground garage. Again, all the cars can be hidden from view and we think that's more than enough parking. If you can turn on the light, Kim, and Anthony just go through it one more time and we'll just stop just at a few points. And then we'll have any questions that the Board wants us to do.

If you stop here – again, what Kim pointed out – there is stair access up to the three units in the front. As you go a little bit further – Kim, if you can point out the stair on the back – it's an open stair.

[Male Voice]: I don't think it works.

Ms. Martelli: On the street map?

Mr. Ryan: Again, that's the entrance to the building. That's the entrance to the backside. It's an open stair. I think we can make that quite attractive. Then a grand entrance because we wanted to feel a sense of connection from Warburton, but we didn't want to emphasize that. Truly, the people that come from inside the garage where they're parked, they come up to the front of the building. Anthony, if you can go a little bit further, again, we'll do some enhancements along the frontage to the property. We plan on some landscaping. There's a tiered landscaping – Anthony, if you can stop here – a tiered landscaping approach because I think we can make it very attractive. And also a grand entrance. So multi-family, but we want it to feel in character with some of the existing single-family and two-family houses that are in the neighborhood.

We have to recognize, though, on this side that we are right across the street from a gas station, as well. It's a commercial use. But we really think we can establish a nice character to this and bring in some of the architecture which I think Kim and Jake had done a really good job of trying to tie that in with some of the local architecture. So keep on going, Anthony.

Again, this is the visual for the existing building as we're approaching the corner. We're going to, again, turn the corner and slow down as you get past the corner here. Again, the visual character along Washington here – if you stop right here – is somewhat obscured from the existing walls that are out there. Again, we believe that we can do a very nice landscape design to improve that. It's not that we're just leaving it alone, but with the existing trees and the overgrown character of that we can do a lot on that property. Again, nothing necessarily to the building, or maybe some appendages to the building in the back that we can remove that were add-ons. But it's almost a restoration of that character, again, in that property. So keep on going.

So I'm going to go past this building slightly and just point out – because neighbors were concerned, an earlier version of this – about the look of this building. Because you see that the elevation on our left-hand side here, that's the driveway for the adjacent neighbor right here. That actually rises up, and that building is up above us. I think it's about 10 feet above us, technically, Anthony, on that property, and Kim. So you will see our building back there, again. But we're trying to give the same character, residential character, on the back of the building as we are on the front of it. You saw that in Kim's drawing. It's not back of house/front of house. We essentially got two entries to the building so we're treating them equally as important.

We are making some changes to the driveway because one of the comments on the existing building was that they see the tenants in there are actually backing out onto the roadway, too. So we've built into the design a turnaround to allow for them to turn around in the property. I think it works quite well. There will be some changes to the front to widen out that driveway, but I think it's only an improvement, recognizing that this is a two-family house and there are two residences there. I think we can improve that situation. Anthony, keep going. Again, you see the back of the building.

So we'll just return and do the end of this, Anthony, and then I'll just make two more points. If there's any questions we can answer at that point.

Again, the character of these buildings that you see, we've gone out, we've taken photographs and we've modeled these buildings. They're not, again, intended to be graphically accurate in terms of the textures of the building, but they are accurate in terms of the massing of the adjacent village. We wanted to understand that relationship there, too. Again, the gas station. A lot of those cars, by the way, we did some observation and we're doing some traffic work on this, as well. Observation – a lot of these cars are overnight cars that are at the gas station, parking along the roadway, too. But there is still on-site parking and on-street parking, as well. We'll just let it run out at this point.

Boardmember Alligood: I have a question.

Mr. Ryan: Sure. You want to stop, Anthony?

Boardmember Alligood: You made the point a couple times about this is picking up architectural elements from the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Ryan: Yes.

Boardmember Alligood: Do you have any examples in your presentation, or anything either in this or in your drive-through, that shows that?

Mr. Ryan: Kim, you want to talk a little bit about that?

Ms. Martelli: I think you're talking about some additional photo representations. We can go back. We started our initial submission with bringing those [off-mic] photos. So we didn't [off-mic] from which ...

Boardmember Alligood: It will be helpful, yeah.

Ms. Martelli: Some of our dormer styles, some of our [off-mic]. The ones that certainly seem to contribute toward providing river views and [off-mic] from each of those residences. A lot of my experience in walking through each of those neighborhood buildings was being able to walk on to each of those residences, porches or terraces or balconies, and seeing how those [off-mic] amenity for all the residences. We want to really create that same feeling for each of the dwelling units. That's a lot of how those projections are created on our own building. But certainly we have to go back and [off-mic] of those photo representations [off-mic] side-by-side characteristics of our building in the neighborhood.

Cable Access Director Corso: I'm sorry. [Unintelligible] hear you.

Ms. Martelli: Sorry.

Cable Access Director Corso: Thank you.

Mr. Ryan: Sorry.

Ms. Martelli: I'll just summarize. But just we'd be happy to go back and give you some photo representation, again, of the neighborhood buildings.

Boardmember Alligood: Yeah. And not so much the point that they have views, but just what elements in that design are you referring to that pick up from the surrounding ...

Ms. Martelli: Sure. Just to summarize, I'll just repeat. And then we'll go back and give you photo ... again, references. But balconies, balconettes, porches, the brick elements from some of the existing adjacent structures within the neighborhood, the window style, our French door styles.

Mr. Ryan: Wood siding, our ...

Ms. Martelli: Again, really, all the architectural materials are pulled from neighboring buildings. Our major opposing building on Washington is this really beautiful brick building with a lot of wonderful characteristics. By bringing that brick back into this box space and portions we are pulling those from some of the existing older structures.

Boardmember O'Reilly: If you're talking about seven units in this building, what is the expected occupancy in the old building?

Ms. Martelli: It's still going to be two dwellings.

Mr. Ryan: Two-family. We're going to keep it just functioning the way that it is, again, with some enhancement in terms of the landscaping.

Boardmember O'Reilly: So the total is nine.

Mr. Ryan: Nine total, yes.

Ms. Martelli: In the sum of the two lots, correct.

Boardmember O'Reilly: And do you expect to excavate very much in order to get parking in the ground?

Mr. Ryan: Yeah. The natural grade when you come out to the roadway – actually, if you can put the grading plan up.

Ms. Martelli: Oh, I'm sorry. I was going to point out that existing [grid] line just to see the existing grade line. It's that dash line that runs through your section. This is taken right at the end of the building where the grade on the site is its lowest. So you do see that a majority of that basement area – I'm sorry, that garage area – is below grade. If you look at the existing site photos and we look at that grading, there is a significant portion to the south of that garage itself where the driveway is, where a previous driveway did exist at some point on this site, and there is relatively low grading in that area.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, one of the features that allowed us to do that, too, was when you take that grade, that lower grade where we're cutting out a portion of a property, and you bring it up to the roadway, we're actually not creating much of a slope to get to that, either. We had to do that, too, because that's where our utilities are coming from. That's where the stormwater is, too, so we wanted to be able to ensure that that driveway grade works. So the grade drops down on that particular location, where the driveway's coming in, nicely. And that'll allow us to preserve that wall, as well.

Ms. Martelli: Yeah, we're coming in around elevation 180 – 182, sorry; 82 is right here, and that's relatively close to where our driveway's starting to enter. So it's sitting right there at the curb line.

Mr. Ryan: So, essentially, we're grading out a basement of the building. We're going to park the basement in the building. So I think that's really, I think, the only other point I want to make tonight is, you know, we'd like to work with the Board and progress this. We are going to be looking at the parking situation. We believe we have more than enough parking; we meet the code requirement. So this is, in our mind, our observation. We've had our traffic people out here looking at this, too. This is a transit-oriented development of sorts, too, because of its proximity to the train station. A lot of the parking here that ... our observation was that people are parking here and walking down to the train, too.

I think it was important to try and create an environment and a parking situation where the residents here are not going to park in the road, they're going to park there. But again, given the proximity to the train station, too, we don't think that we're going to actually need all the parking that we're providing. That's our experience. We have a lot of examples of that. We do a lot of work with transit-oriented development in this kind of proximity to train stations and train station parking. We think that's more than enough parking. But we wanted to make sure that all parking was contained on-site because of concerns we heard from the neighbors.

Yes, sir?

Boardmember O'Reilly: Yeah. We often know, when parking is provided in a building people often times don't use it and try to use it for storage.

Mr. Ryan: Right.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Is there any allowance for resident storage outside of their own apartments in this complex?

Mr. Ryan: Kim, I don't think we have that. But if the numbers and the Board would work with us on it, we could create storage and actually lose some parking. I think, again, my point would be that we have more than enough parking and we more than comply with the code. We can convert that. But the plan right now is, I think the units are generous enough that we're not looking at real tight kind of studio places here. They're two- and three-bedroom units here. I think there's going to be more than adequate room for storage within the units themselves, and that's how they were designed. That was something we asked the developer to consider, as well.

Ms. Martelli: Just for reference – and you'll see it in the bottom right-hand corner of drawing A-2, the architectural floor plans – the smallest dwelling units, the one-bedrooms, are over 1,000 square feet and the largest three-bedrooms are just a scooch over 2,000. So again, as I was describing those units, they really are designed to be generous. Although we've given you a schematic, we certainly have the opportunity to create the detailing of seasonal storage. And perhaps there's some outdoor components that residents may just store things like motorcycles, or outdoor space. It's not quite that type of a development that might contribute to those. But should we get into maybe bicycles, that seems like it'd be a wonderful opportunity.

We actually have a gray hatched area on that ground floor which gives us area beyond the dimension of the handicap access aisle. We could do a great bike rack there, and just encourage the fact that this is a great area for easy access to downtown; not only pedestrian-friendly, but bike-friendly, too.

Mr. Ryan: Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: So any comments from the Board on what they've seen?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, I have a question. You mentioned during the presentation that the existing two-story building is higher, the peak of the roof is higher, than the proposed two-story building. But you don't give measurements for the existing building's height.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, we actually have it on the table land use. Let me just look quickly.

Ms. Martelli: I believe we're about 34 feet from existing grade to the peak of ... do you have that?

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, it says 30-35. But it's just below 34 feet.

Ms. Martelli: Right. So you can get sort of a sense of what the differentiation is between the existing roofline and newly-proposed building. Again, with the way zoning runs, we are looking at relatively close existing grades as cut through both of those buildings. The grade does slightly rise up from front to back of the building, but it's about a 9-foot difference between these two building heights.

Boardmember Ambrozek: In conjunction with the Village Green Code, you mentioned just now that you were considering a bicycle rack. That's certainly something that we would encourage through the Green Code.

Is there any plan to reuse gray water?

Mr. Ryan: No, we haven't really put that in the program. It's something we could look into. Generally, we've gotten a lot of pushback on residential properties and gray water. We actually like the concept that it can be done, but it requires some kind of treatment.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Basically, you have a flat roof.

Mr. Ryan: Yes.

Boardmember Ambrozek: That would be, possibly, an excellent opportunity to capture also gray water, at least for irrigation purposes.

Mr. Ryan: Yes. One of the other things is a cistern system that we're thinking about as well, too. You know, other ways to deal with stormwater, too. We do have built into this – and, obviously, we have to do some testing – an infiltration system that's designed into this to take all the rooftop and all the driveway grading and impervious area. One of the great benefits of these types of developments, when you can put parking underneath you reduce all that stormwater consideration. I think you tend to be a little more attractive as a building when you do that, too. But I think there are some green aspects to the design that we're still looking at.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, we'll certainly look at the hardscape coverage of the lot.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Well, I missed the meeting. But in December, I don't know whether anything was done then. But certainly this is a vast improvement over what we saw previously, I have to say. That's my impression.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, thank you.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I actually wanted to say that I'm very particularly pleased that you are going to preserve the existing two-family building. And that you're going to make improvements, as you pointed out, for the parking area and some of the landscaping, providing a separate access through the wall into the building instead of just through the driveway.

Mr. Ryan: Thank you. That was a very striking aspect before we got into the design, when we went out, we looked at the site, for Mr. Cortese. We thought that building is something I think that we can do something with, too. Again, I'm looking forward ... I'm a professional landscape architect. I own John Meyer Consulting. But as a landscape architect, I see a lot of possibilities with that property, too, to really enhance the character of that area.

Boardmember Ambrozek: It appears that you're going to put in the utilities – the telephone, the gas and electricity – all underground.

Mr. Ryan: Yes.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I'm wondering whether you are also going to make provisions for things like a cable TV connection, fiber optic.

Mr. Ryan: Yes. Whatever's available, latest and greatest technology.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: All of the utilities have to be cleared by the county because it's on a county road. So all that has to go through county engineering, all the utilities.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Right. But I mean, from a plan point of view I'm saying it's preferable to put them in underground than to have them coming in as overhead lines.

Mr. Ryan: We absolutely agree; absolutely agree with that, too. I think the utilities on the opposite side of the road, as well as the overhead utilities, is actually a benefit to us, too, because it clears that front of the property, too. Because when a property's elevated like that utilities tend to be a little bit in the visual path. So I think that was a benefit here that we saw, as well.

Boardmember Alligood: I guess I'm kind of in a different place in terms of the kind of questions I have. Because I feel like we're jumping into kind of details at this point in time. I'd like to understand what kind of variances you're asking for because it's true that this still is quite outside the bounds of what's as-of-right on this property. So I'd like to understand what you're asking for, and also where the hardship is that is still requiring you to build much beyond the allowable lot.

And maybe, Marianne, if you have some questions about, basically, any compliance issues or questions.

Village Attorney Stecich: Well, the first one is like a really basic one on the subdivision. Now, under the state law you can't create a lot that's not conforming. So what happens, the way you've divided this up you've made Lot A nonconforming because the house ends up having too much coverage. It adds up because it used to have an adequate rear yard. But since you made one of the side yards the rear yard, it doesn't have an adequate rear yard. And, oh, I think it doesn't have an adequate setback either, a side yard setback. Because of the length of the lot, you have to add [maps and papers rustling against mics – impossible to hear] foot for every 10 feet over the length of the side yard.

Anyway, that, to me, is (inaudible) Lot A is not conforming. So you're doing a subdivision that's making that house nonconforming, and you can't do that. They can go to the Zoning Board for a variance for that and this board can make a recommendation on that variance. I mean, if you're going to go forward with something like this it might make some sense to see if they could get variances from the Zoning Board first. OK, that's one set of [off-mic].

Each of them ... because of where you drew the lot line the existing house is not conforming for coverage.

Ms. Martelli: Correct, existing.

Village Attorney Stecich: Even forget about the driveways. Even if you take the house itself, the house itself still exceeds 15 percent. Remember, these are very small limits in this. You know now, after going to the Zoning Board, that the rest of this stuff is included. And the reason I mention this is, one of the concerns voiced at the Zoning Board was, listen, even the house is over the 15 percent. So that house isn't a whole lot over 15 percent, the existing one. I mean, it is if you include the paved area. But the house itself is over. If you moved the lot line away from Washington – I guess further south – you could eliminate a lot of those problems because you'd meet your coverage, you'd meet your setback, you'd be able to reconfigure so you'd have your rear yard setbacks. Those would be set. OK, that's fine.

Even now, certainly, it'd be exacerbated if you moved the lot line. There's a huge, huge coverage variance required for the new building. The new building, I did a rough calculation. I think it's probably about 60 by 80.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, I think we actually indicate it's about 40 percent coverage compared to the 15 percent that's allowed. We did the calculation on the table (inaudible).

Village Attorney Stecich: But does that include your paved area?

Mr. Ryan: Yes, it does.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, no. But I'm saying even if you take only the building, if you take over the building ...

Mr. Ryan: We would be over, yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: ... they have 4,800 square feet. Even the building itself is 30 percent. I'm just telling you, having heard what I did at the Zoning Board, there's some concern about ...

[cross-talk]

Mr. Ryan: Some very valid points, and we are aware of them. I think I'm just going to talk from the planning perspective. When we initially came in to here, and we saw that they would need variances on the coverage but because they wanted to connect the building we thought that, from a planning standpoint, it could be improved. We could take that building off, would not connect it, and deal with a variance on the single lot. The subdivision was something that we thought actually we could create a benefit, I think, in terms of overall design. So that was from the planning standpoint.

Village Attorney Stecich: I think everybody agrees, probably, that subdivision's a better idea. And then you remember at the initial meeting, we had I had said – with Kim and Lino – why don't you just subdivide this.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, we ...

Village Attorney Stecich: But wait. Could I just finish on the variances, Jim?

Mr. Ryan: Sure, of course. Of course, yeah.

Village Attorney Stecich: I think you can probably meet them, but your side yard calculations are a little bit off because of that extra measurement you have to do. But not a lot.

Chairman Cameron: You had an extra request for every ...

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, we actually considered that in the calculation. Anthony, that extra foot on the height.

[Male Voice]: [Off-mic].

Boardmember Sullivan: It's when you have a yard . When your side yard is over 50 feet, then you need to add a foot for every 10 feet over 50.

Chairman Cameron: We had a long discussion about it at a prior meeting.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, we'll recheck that.

Village Attorney Stecich: It's just a couple of figures.

Chairman Cameron: [Off-mic].

Village Attorney Stecich: Well, Jamie and I did it.

Then your chart had a list of parking setbacks, which I don't know what that means. There's one setback. There's no special setback for parking.

Mr. Ryan: OK, we'll look at that.

Village Attorney Stecich: It's just a setback. So you're going to need variances for most of your yards because of parking.

Ms. Martelli: Marianne, I just want to make sure that you said ... we were highlighting that one in the developable area, but we'll look really carefully. This setback we have, I indicated, to the building is the one that addresses the actual length of that lot line beyond the 10 feet, where we have a 16-foot setback. So we will go back and make sure the consideration for any walking space or walkways within that area does not ... I think as long as we were 10 feet – if I recall correctly, 10 feet – for walkways and pervious areas away from the side lot line we were compliant. I don't recall our walkways within the side yard.

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't think so.

Ms. Martelli: Four feet into ... we will check that.

Village Attorney Stecich: There's no separate setback for walkways.

Ms. Martelli: Oh, for sidewalks versus building. OK. Maybe that's in the code, not in Hastings.

Village Attorney Stecich: Then I think you said you need all the parking. But if your chart was right, don't you need a variance for one parking space on lot A?

Mr. Ryan: It's at the end of the driveway.

Village Attorney Stecich: You have three provided on your chart. Maybe the chart's wrong.

Mr. Ryan: That's the turnaround, too.

Village Attorney Stecich: So I think you should show the parking space.

And then one other thing. Check your chart on this one that says "floor and roof plan." You're doing the open space calculations and you're counting studios in there. You don't have any studios, do you?

Ms. Martelli: Oh, we apologize. We'll make that correction. I'll correct that. It's my error.

Mr. Ryan: And I think we know that we have a burden on the variances, too. I don't know if Lino wants to comment on that. But we've also looked at all the properties, virtually all the properties, around this, that surround this, to exceed it. In my experience with zoning boards, too, they will consider character. What basically surrounds this property is every single lot ... well, not every single lot. There's a couple that comply, but very few if any comply with that code requirement. But it's about character, about trying to create something, I think, that fits in with this particular neighborhood. But we'll look very closely at those variances and talk to your board more about those.

Mr. Sciarretta: Just to echo what Jim said, we were before the Zoning Board. Marianne was there during the discussion. We are faced with the 15 percent and, again, the character of the neighborhood. We didn't get into it so much at that Zoning Board meeting because it was mainly an interpretation at that meeting. Again, should we have to go back there, which we do, we would present that analysis at that meeting with respect to the character of the neighborhood. But I echo what Jim said. We have that burden to show.

Boardmember Sullivan: A number of things that I was concerned about other people have spoken about. But I come back to the size of this development. I appreciate the effort that you have had, you've extended, to reach out to the community and discuss with the neighborhood and residents what their concerns were. I think you've not improved the parking situation on Lot A with what you're showing here. I think the parking for that building needs to be looked at. I can foresee people needing to be backing onto Washington again with how that area is configured. I also have concerns because it's in the rear yard, at this point. Just not enough breathing space between that building and the building next to it.

Mr. Ryan: OK.

Boardmember Sullivan: The concern, you talked about the grand entrance. But much of your presentation focused on the driveway. What I saw before hearing how you presented it was that the units in the back, the four units, basically have no relationship to the street and so have not connection to the street and are very dissimilar and not keeping in character with the neighborhood. The four units back there have an impoverished connection by having to walk down a small stair through a parking garage, across a driveway, to get to the sidewalk. So I'd like to really rethink the experience that those residents are going to have. They're basically in a dark backyard where their front door is.

And I have concerns about the size. This is a very busy neighborhood, very busy intersection, and this is a lot of traffic to be adding. The hardship that Eva mentioned is more the hardship you're going to be providing through traffic on Warburton and Washington.

Boardmember Alligood: I want to actually echo something that Kathy pointed out, which was what struck me in the presentation, [maps and papers rustling against mics – impossible to hear] variance is this huge opening that's been created from the street that practically looks like a road. When you peer into it, what you're going to see is the garage.

Chairman Cameron: Or the dumpster.

Boardmember Alligood: Or the dumpster. What you're creating as the grand entrance is not what you're going to really experience as either somebody driving down Warburton or a pedestrian. They're going to see this huge [inaudible] that's been created and a lot of retaining ... what I noticed was a lot of walls that come up to create that opening from the street because you're so much higher – the building is so much higher – than the street. That's exactly what I'm talking about. When you come down the street, you're going to look at the side of the building. That's what you're going to experience. The grand entrance, that's something you see in renderings. You're never going to be up that high to be taking that in as your impression of the building. Your impression of the building is going to be exactly that view you just showed, which is oriented to the car. That concerns me, just visually and also from the ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: It's very out of character.

Boardmember Alligood: Completely out of character.

Chairman Cameron: The staircase is coming out of the ground. I don't understand why the land's not higher going up in front of those staircases. Because there's no foliage down there. I think you're going to have some issues, as we said earlier, with the side lot requirements. Maybe you'll get some space by narrowing the building to put some foliage in there or something to soften the building.

Boardmember Alligood: But that particular view I would argue is not ... I can't think of one building on Warburton in the immediate vicinity that looks like that. That's why I was curious sort of what is it about this building that is making it blend in with the rest of the neighborhood. I just want to clarify. I'm not saying that a building has to look exactly like the buildings around it or that it can't have some modern elements. I think sometimes that actually is an asset in a neighborhood, when you're not just trying to just imitate what's around it but you do try to find a way to harmonize with what's around it. And I think in terms of massing and the experience of this building, how it's laid out, is not [background noise].

Mr. Ryan: Again, that particular view, too, I believe is right across the street from the gas station.

Boardmember Alligood: You keep making that point.

Mr. Ryan: But I think it's important to look at ...

Boardmember Alligood: Both sides of the street are residential. So the fact that you have a gas station across the street doesn't mean that you then say ... what is that saying?

Mr. Ryan: I'm not dismissing it. But what I believe you have to recognize in design is that it's in context here that we are in almost a transition area of a transition between commercial properties and residential properties, trying to create a residential environment. This particular glimpse here, first of all we have to meet a certain driveway standard. If I could narrow it, and this board or the Zoning Board would allow me to do that, we've done that quite frequently to be able to narrow that and modify the landscape here.

This particular view here, this is a half-a-second drive past this property. It's not going to, I think, establish that the character of this building, this particular ...

Boardmember Alligood: This is a corner that many, many people in this town experience all the time. It's on the way to the train station, it's on the way up from Yonkers, it's on the way down to Yonkers. This is not an inconspicuous spot in Hastings. So the fact that it has a gas station across the street has nothing to do with whether we ...

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, I'm not trying to minimize that. Again, we're trying to establish something with regard to massing. And I understand your comments, and those are things that we can work on, too. Again, I have to ... first of all, I think there are some of ... the attributes of this, the driveway ... if I could minimize the driveway I certainly would. It's within the requirements of the code to establish a certain width here. If I could narrow that I'd like to do that. I'd like to do different kinds of paved surfaces along that driveway to change that character. If we're permitted to do that, may do some impervious – or excuse me, pervious – pavers or block pavers to establish kind of a different feel for that.

But those are great comments. Those are things we can work on. That's really why we're here, to try and get that kind of feedback.

Boardmember Alligood: But what I don't want to feel like when I look at that is that I'm on Central Ave. I'm sorry, I'm just going to ... I don't want to ... because that ... there are buildings on Central Avenue that have that feeling of you're looking up at a building.

Mr. Ryan: OK.

Boardmember Alligood: And that's ... I'm just ...

Mr. Ryan: No, I appreciate the comment.

Boardmember Alligood: I appreciate that you're preserving a building that has character on the corners. I do want to acknowledge, among others, that that is a good step forward. But I just ... I don't ... you haven't made the case for how this is really in keeping.

Mr. Ryan: Well, that's something that we can work on. That's something we'll work on.

Boardmember Sullivan: But I think part of the problem is that it's a lot ... it's too big, you know, and there's not enough breathing space, there's not enough consideration. Because another thing to think about vis-à-vis being on the street and feeling that you're walking by a large parking area is the positioning of the driveway, or the turnaround, or, slash, fourth parking space in the front yard, the old front yard, of the building of the retaining. So there's kind of a lack of consideration.

Mr. Ryan: Kim, can you put that up? One of the things that we thought about here was actually what I was talking about along the frontage is do something a little different with pavement textures and so on so it's not getting the feel of that.

Boardmember Sullivan: It's going to be ... you're driving down Washington, walking down Washington, and there's going to be a car in the front yard. So that's what I see.

Mr. Ryan: OK, in that particular location, too – and we'll show you a section of that, that's actually behind a wall – we'll show that. There's some things that we have to articulate related to that. So we'll work on that.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, articulate or rethink?

Mr. Ryan: I'm sorry.

Boardmember Sullivan: I mean, you can articulate what you have already, or ...

[cross-talk]

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, sure.

Boardmember Sullivan: ... the size of what you're putting on this lot.

Mr. Ryan: So there's an existing wall that comes all the way to here. That wall is about 4 feet high, I believe, at that location there.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Sir, you have to talk into the microphone.

Mr. Ryan: So right along the front here I'm trying to get a walkway in from the street, but there's an existing wall here. It's about 4 feet high, and I think that it would hide anything. We can do things, and we've added some landscape there. So, I mean, in terms of articulate it's just present to you a sectional view or a simulation similar to what we've done. We can actually show what that would look like from out in the street. We did the 3-D modeling from here, so now I'll show it with cars in there, too, to give you a look at what we think it actually pretty well would hide any cars there. Or we'll take that car out.

What has to be recognized, at least from our perspective, is that this house exists and there is a lot less of a driveway here. And it's been functioning like that for a long, long time. We were just looking for ways to improve that situation. We heard from one of the neighbors back here. They said what they'd like is, can you do something to turn it around because we see cars backing out – they back out – onto the roadway. So we were just looking for a way to improve that. But the way it is now, and the way that it functions and the way it's functioned for years, is, there's basically one or two parking spaces. They tandem park in that area, and then they back onto the road. So we were just looking for a way to improve that. We can work on that if that concern is that look right there. We'll have to do something else with that.

Chairman Cameron: But if you made the building itself a little narrower you could actually get trees on the southern edge of it to the right, to the southern side of what I'll call "the road." No, I'm looking at your new building, right over there. Keep on, all the way down below the parking. Below the driveway, you could put trees in there if you made the building narrower. Which you're going to have to do anyway because the lines you drew for the side yards are wrong because you haven't taken into account 295-20(g).

Ms. Martelli: Just so we get the right spot with respect to this edge ...

Chairman Cameron: Well, that's one way of making that street look less like a street. And I'm just calling it a street because it looked to me like a street, too. But the other problem you have is the setback you have, at 13-1/4 feet, I do not believe satisfies 295-20(g). I'm talking about the other one. Right there.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, the building is 16 feet. But we have to straighten out that side yard line.

Chairman Cameron: But you have to also make it wider, the setback.

Ms. Martelli: I think we'll go back and look [off-mic] first identify the line. We've done it [off-mic]. As you said, we'll adjust the size of [off-mic] to accommodate that setback.

Chairman Cameron: And I think what you've done as part of the building, when it's hiding behind the wall it's not bad. When you come in from the south, you look at the building, these staircases just jump straight up out of the ground. My [case] isn't perfect, but to me they look pretty awful.

Mr. Ryan: OK.

Village Attorney Stecich: Jamie, could I ask one other question?

Chairman Cameron: Sure.

Village Attorney Stecich: Which of the apartments was going to be the affordable apartment?

Ms. Martelli: Right now we're under an eight-unit mix.

Mr. Ryan: Seven units here in the building.

Ms. Martelli: Right, [off-mic].

Village Attorney Stecich: Let me double-check. We changed the law fairly recently.

Ms. Martelli: I recall it was 2013.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, there's no minimum. So it's 15 feet.

Ms. Martelli: It's 8.

Village Attorney Stecich: See, it used to be right there. It says, "*Fifteen percent of all units in the development shall be in affordable.*" So if you do 15 percent of seven you get one. It's 295-112.1.

Ms. Martelli: We'd be happy to look at the zoning and make sure we are following in accordance with the regulations.

Village Attorney Stecich: The new thing is the zoning eight and over, but I don't believe that's correct.

Mr. Sciarretta: Just reading here, it says "*set-aside requirement before the Planning Board may approve site plan for residential development.*"

Village Attorney Stecich: Oh, it does. Eight or more. The size percentage, you're right, that's where it came from. Thanks, Lino.

Mr. Ryan: So we have some work to do.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you very much.

Mr. Ryan: OK, thank you for your time.

Sue Smith, Affordable Housing Committee: Could I ask a question for information?

Chairman Cameron: Sure.

Ms. Smith: With the stairs in the front and the back, the best that I can see from a distance – and I haven't seen these before – it looks to me like it's a fairly steep ... whatever apartment it is, it's not handicapped-accessible.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Right.

Ms. Smith: Am I correct?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yeah.

Chairman Cameron: I had that on my list. Are there any questions for the public on this? I'm sorry. Are there any members of the public here who would like to speak on this?

Mr. Ryan: We'll see you. Thank you very much.

VI. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS (Continued)

2. Subdivision and Site Plan Approval Application of Ginsburg Development Companies, LLC, for:

1) the subdivision of a 7.45-acre tract of land situated on the westerly side of Saw Mill River Road (State Route 9-A), immediately south of the municipal boundary with the unincorporated area of the Town of Greenburgh and approximately 0.3 miles south of the intersection of Lawrence Street and Saw Mill River Road, into a total of three lots, and

2) site plan approval for the development of the three lots for a multi-family dwelling complex with a total of 66 dwelling units, 12 of which are proposed to be affordable units.

Chairman Cameron: So, Bruce, be properly advised that you're up next. Actually, Bruce, we're going to have Marianne do a little recap of where we are. And then you're up.

Village Attorney Stecich: Just to bring us up to speed, this is very, very brief. I'm not bringing you back to 2000.

Bruce Lozito, Ginsburg Development Companies: I'll do that.

Village Attorney Stecich: Just this past summer, this board completed its SEQRA review of the project, and recommended the Board of Trustees approve the concept plan. It, as you know, had a long list of conditions. The Board of Trustees then held a public hearing on the concept plan and, on October 15, approved it, which is the last decision the Board of Trustees makes on this. The term "concept plan" is a bit of a misnomer in this particular project because once it has concept plan approval from the Board of Trustees that's it. Everything else now is in the Planning Board's hands and the ARB and the Building Department.

The Board of Trustees approved it subject to the same conditions as the Planning Board, plus a couple of extras here. Jamie requested I bring the Board of Trustees approval, which is right here. It includes all your conditions. The only extra conditions were that it needs subdivision approval, site plan approval, has to meet the Green Code, and needs ARB approval. Do you guys want this?

Chairman Cameron: One through 20 are ours.

Village Attorney Stecich: Most of those conditions you don't really have to do much now. It's before the Planning Board now for subdivision approval for four lots – one for each of the buildings and one for the parcel they're going to give over to the Village – site plan approval, steep slopes approval. There are some steep slopes along the river at the southern boundary, and then at the northern end of Lot 3. It's got to go to the ARB before final approval. This probably makes sense as a next step to go to the ARB just in case that needs any other changes.

The other thing I did, I know you all have your codes. But I copied the site plan requirements just to give us an idea of what we have to review this round because there's so much we looked at before – Buddy and Mike and Bruce. You see I drafted it, the things in site plan approval, that I think you had to look at – some more than others. A lot of this stuff was looked at, but not all of it was. So the covenants are deed restrictions. There's quite a few covenants involved and easements involved in this project. I think that was one of our conditions, but we need to see all of those at some point before you give site plan approval – planting plan – but I get to that further down.

Two is obvious: “*the location of all existing and proposed lot lines, easements, reservations.*” That's relevant to the subdivision, and then the easements I just mentioned.

On six: “*the existing and proposed use of all land and the exterior design of all the existing and proposed buildings and structures, including grades, façades and other architectural features,*” and “*the location and attachment of mechanical equipment and appurtenance to the exterior.*” Those are things we didn't look at on our SEQRA review.

Then 9, 10 and 11: “*the location, the layout of the driveways.*” We looked at it generally, but you might want to be more specific about site lines and stuff like that. Obviously, the landscaping is (inaudible).

And then: “*the location of all existing and proposed outdoor storage areas, including snow storage.*” Then the water lines and all of that. You're probably going to get your engineer's help on that.

Mr. Lozito: Right.

Village Attorney Stecich: If there's any fences and retaining walls, the lighting if there's any signs. I imagine there's going to be some signage on the property. And then the reason I had this existing soils and topography, well, that relates to steep slopes. And also a couple of the conditions on our previous approval related to soils – soils testing in a couple of situations. And then stormwater pollution, prevention and [planning]. Most of this stuff has been submitted, but that's the stuff you would look at.

Then the reason I have this ... oh, wait, I didn't put it on yours. I put it on the bottom at the end. We can't forget we've got to make the finding for recreational facilities.

Mr. Lozito: Right.

Village Attorney Stecich: That'll have to be part of the site plan approval.

So that's it.

Chairman Cameron: So from there, one of you will give us a brief summary?

Mr. Lozito: Not do it now necessarily, but the site plan approval checklist that we had to provide with the application does go through these points and indicates what plan you'd find the various items on. You can look at that. But I just want to run through the bigger aspects of it, the bigger elements.

This, as you may recognize, is the concept plan that was based on your board's instrumental input, if I may say. Just to remind you, it's the 66 units with 27 market rate units in each of these buildings, and the 12 affordable units in this building. There are 116 parking spaces for the residents in garages; 70 spaces in the garages, and then 46 spaces on surface. There's the extra 10 public parking spaces for the pedestrian bridge to the South County Trailway. There's two access points from Saw Mill River Road. I'm doing this because I'm going to go through what the changes are to the site plan from this. Essentially, it's this concept.

Another key feature was protecting the Norway spruce trees and setting Building B back so those could survive. And, of course, creating that 1.8 acre open space parcel.

So those were the key elements of the approved concept plan, which are all embodied in the site plan that was submitted to you. There'll be some differences, but you can see, essentially, that the overall configuration, location, size of all the things are the same. I'll point out what the changes are.

Virtually all of them were in response to requests that were made to us by the Board and, perhaps, the Village Board, and certain departments who were reviewing the plan. Probably one of the more important features, I think, to this board might be we have reinstated that community seating area. If you remember, in our original submission this year we had one between the affordable building and the market rate building, and it was down here. Then when we put the affordable building in the center, we thought that really melded it into the community sufficiently. But we did hear some requests that we have some common outdoor area where everybody in the community would meet, socialize and what have you. So we did put that back. We put it here so that it actually straddles the boundary. It really emphasizes the fact that it's a shared facility. We didn't put it here, although it's a bigger space. This, you'll see later, is the area of the steep slopes so we didn't want to put any more disturbance in that area. We tried to minimize the steep slope disturbance by placing it here. I think it's more of an intimate location, at that point.

The other things we had to do – this was in response to the Fire Department's review – if you may recall, we had last proposed a driveway that was 19 feet in width, with the parallel parking on either side. The Fire Department wasn't comfortable with that, and they asked us to enlarge it. Particularly in light of the fact that there were two 3-story buildings that they would approach a fire with an aerial apparatus. So they wanted to be sure they had a wide enough driveway to use that aerial apparatus. They agreed on a 22-foot section in front of each of the three-story buildings, but enabled us to keep a 20-foot section in front of Building 2 – Building B, rather, the affordable building – because we were pinched between the setback and the Norway spruce do-not-disturb area. Since that was adequate for the two-story building by code, the 20 feet, they agreed in a meeting that we had just recently to accept that, with a 22-foot wide drive in the other areas of the site.

We also simplified the entrance drives a little bit in an effort to reduce some of the impervious. Because we were widening the road a bit, we're trying to find ways to compensate for the additional impervious. So by eliminating the island in the middle of these two drives, we were able to shrink down the width of these entryways, reduce impervious. Another thing we did along those lines was to introduce permeable pavers wherever there is parallel parking, which would be a nice element both aesthetically and also from a stormwater function as well as a green building aspect of things. At the entrance to each building, we're going to do a paver strip across the drive that serves as sort of a notice that you're at a pedestrian area. And also, maybe a little bit of a rumble so there's sort of a traffic calming kind of measure.

A couple other little details. We were asked by both, I think, this board and the county to put a sign that highlighted the fact that there was public access to the trailway here. So we've proposed a sign right here that will look something like this. If anybody has any other ideas we're certainly open to them. We added a bicycle rack, which is another green building requirement. Those are little things, but they're important, as well.

Another thing that we're including that we just hadn't gotten into the last time around, and it's mentioned in a number of places, is that there are cross-easements for virtually every purpose. So although we're creating three lots primarily for financing purposes, this will operate as a unified development. There's cross-easements for parking, for access – pedestrian access – access to open space areas, access to the community seating area. Everybody has the right to go anywhere on the property as well as to be able to get to these dedicated open spaces. Those easements will also apply to stormwater management, utility service and things like that, again in the attempt to make this one unified development – except for the purposes of having some legal outlines, too, to separate them on paper, but really not in any other way.

I think those were the key changes. The lot sizes, the building sizes, are identical to what was on the approved concept plan. We revised the grading plan we had done previously and the stormwater management plan to reflect the new building layout, and that's shown here. Probably the two key features that you see on this plan are the two bioretention basins which we had previously – which are to handle stormwater runoff both for quality purposes and for quantity control – such that, as designed, this project will still reduce both the peak rates of runoff and the volumes of runoff, in the post development, from what exists currently today. We gave you a new SWPPP, we gave you the narrative portion in your packages. There's two copies of the full drainage calculations in the Building Department that I assume your engineer will take a look at to verify that. We gave you the narrative so you could see the overall approach.

So it's similar to what you had seen previously, bioretention serving the primary function. There are a couple of mechanical water quality features just to serve some areas in the driveways that go down to the garages. But other than that, it's the same as the proposal we had shared with you previously. You could see here, by the grading, we've kept this steep slope area here relatively untouched. What's kind of grown on us as a concept is, there's one place right here where you don't have the very steep embankments that you do along the rest of the river that are maybe 10 or 12 feet high. Here the land slopes down to a point where you get quite close to the river, so we thought it would be very nice for people to be able to walk down there. I'll show you the planting plans; we've added plantings here to make it a much more attractive area. It would be a nice place to just come down, picnic, do what have you – again, accessible to everybody who resides at the development. And the grading was designed to do that – to keep this gentle slope continuing down.

Utilities are the same as we had previously presented. There's water, electric and gas in 9-A that would serve the buildings with service lines. No new public mains. The buildings, for sewer service, would connect to the county trunk sewer that runs through the site, as they did in the past. So I think those are the key features of the site grading utility plan. Again, they resemble what was on the plans previously submitted; they've just been refined to fit the new layout.

For the first time we've developed pretty detailed planting plans, quite detailed planting plans. We enlarged these. So this is roughly half the site on this sheet, and I'll show you the other. I'm advised by our landscape architects that all of the materials that are proposed are either native ... and non-invasive plants. This site, as you probably know, has a lot of vines and other vegetation that is quite invasive. It has run amok. So virtually anything we do on this site is going to be a major improvement. But we've designed the planting plan to emphasize native plants and not include any invasive plants. Again, one of the main features is the berm along Route 9-A, which would be topped with various types of evergreens, larger shade trees – other shade trees that are also ornamental, that flower – which would be principally along the interior roadway. There will be ornamental grasses along the berm and other ground covers to make this a very attractive feature as you come in that are natural-looking; not a formal, rigid-looking landscaping scheme, but a more natural, flowing kind of a scheme that one would experience coming down Saw Mill River Road.

There will be all native plantings in the bioretention basins. There will be native plantings along the river, as I mentioned before, in that area where it's become accessible to people to come down and sit. We're doing various plantings – rhododendron, azalea and whatnot – for foundation plantings and around that community seating area. That concept is carried through the entire site and on to the southern portion, where the berm continues with the same approach, of course. Another bioretention with the native plantings and various plantings interspersed throughout the site. So you have a very detailed planting list. We tried to break it down so you could see what we're doing on the berm, what we're doing around the buildings, what's in the bioretention basins and what's along the river.

Again, better shown on the previous scheme, saving these Norway spruce trees in front of Building B. One of the features GDC typically likes to do is really accentuate the entrances the buildings and the site with flowers – perennials, annuals – so they'll do that kind of thing to really add sparkle at the key entry points into the site and the buildings. One of the things I think Marianne just mentioned was a lighting plan. This was developed, again, with the Green Building Code in mind; to have all downward-facing fixtures so the areas of lighting do not extend over any property lines – effectively don't extend over any of the impervious areas. They do a little bit at the entrance, but that's where you want to have some light for safety reasons. So we provided this to satisfy that requirement.

Village Attorney Stecich: Those light boxes there, that depicts ...

Mr. Lozito: I forget what that outer limit is. I think it's 0.25 foot candles. That's where it gets very, very, very low. So it's almost ... beyond that, it's practically ...

Village Attorney Stecich: That represents where the lights will be.

Mr. Lozito: The glare, right. There's a little spot value. They show the higher intensity and how it lowers as it goes out from the fixture.

We're staying with the architectural approach that we showed you last time. This is that representation of what it would look like from Route 9-A. This is the north market rate building with the berm, with the evergreens, with the flowering ornamental trees, the shade trees, various seasonal planting – some perennial, some annual – so you get a nice feel of how the building is softened – not completely hidden, but softened – as you go by on Route 9-A. This particular viewpoint shows the fact that the berm is up. The building is actually down a little lower than the road elevation. So between the berm and the change in elevation – between the street and the building – you're practically seeing just the two stories of the three-story building. Here's the first floor kind of peeking through here, but the mass is mostly of the upper two floors of the three-story building.

Again, the architecture of the affordable building matches the architecture of the market rate buildings. Here are two Norway spruce trees, in an attempt to show what they might look like. That's the view from the inside of the site as opposed to on the outside of the berms. You're not seeing the berm in the foreground.

One of the changes I should have mentioned in the site plan – not a very noticeable one – is, we did enlarge the footprint of Building B to increase the size of those units so the affordable units would meet the state maximums. We did that, and the floor plans that you have in front of you in your package of the affordable building show those larger units. And I must confess, only one of the units doesn't meet that maximum. It's the studio that's 535 square feet instead of 550. But just within the confines of making all the other buildings meet the standards and getting adequate access, this was just a little shy. But it certainly meets it in spirit. It's larger than ...

Village Attorney Stecich: What were the numbers?

Mr. Lozito: This one is 535 instead of 550 so it's 15 square feet. But we have other units that are larger: 958 instead of 950. We talked with the state and explained that you folks wanted to see them at the max. Realizing how difficult it is to get it exact, they said if it's a little over they would forgive us. Most of them are over a little bit. Just that one is under a little bit. I think you've had the plans for the market rate building before, going way back. So we just developed those a little further. They're in your package. Again, it's the 27 units in each three-story building. So there's nine residential units per floor. The total mix is six 1-bedrooms, six 3-bedrooms, and I guess that would leave forty-two 2-bedrooms in both market rate building.

Each floor has a common area on it, which on the first floor is the entry, the lobby and so on. The second floor would be a fitness room. And then the third floor would be sort of an all-purpose room, if you will.

Chairman Cameron: What's the setback, the narrow quarter-space you have on every floor?

Mr. Lozito: This one?

Chairman Cameron: No, keep going to the right.

Mr. Lozito: To the right?

Chairman Cameron: To the left, sorry. The other way. Right there, stop. What's that?

Mr. Lozito: This here?

Chairman Cameron: It's a library or something? I don't know what it is. It's on every floor.

Mr. Lozito: Oh, this is a trash chute. That's access to the trash chute. You had me there for a second.

Chairman Cameron: Well, you could put bookcases down both sides.

[laughter]

Mr. Lozito: Or maybe artwork.

These are rather nice units. They range from, I think it was, 900 for a one-bedroom – 952 square feet for the one-bedroom, two-bath; 1,700 for a three-bedroom. And again, the thinking is we're going to build it as a rental now, but in future we want to be able to convert it to condo. That's what we feel the market would require when we get to that phase.

Another thing I just want to mention, we gave you a site section that we developed. We know that the building height was a sensitive issue last time around, and in relocating the buildings where we did for the concept plan we eliminated the height issue by putting the buildings on more level portions of the site. These sections are to depict the worst case scenario. When you take existing grade and create the plane, these are the three worst case scenarios. Buildings C and B, virtually no problem; A, no problem. The only issue we had was "the sculpture," as I called it last time.

[laughter]

Chairman Cameron: We call it the (inaudible).

Village Attorney Stecich: You could call it a sculpture.

Mr. Lozito: Well, it has a carving.

[laughter]

So actually, this parapet is fine. This is this feature above it. So if we could, with a straight face, consider that a sculpture then we don't have a problem.

[laughter]

If we can't, then we would probably just eliminate it.

Chairman Cameron: I think it looks fine on the affordables.

Mr. Lozito: Well, it actually fits there.

Chairman Cameron: I know.

Mr. Lozito: But we wouldn't want them to be different, though.

Village Attorney Stecich: You ought to explain that the height limitation doesn't apply to a few things like steeple, spiral staircases, antennas and sculptures.

Boardmember Alligood: I'm sorry. I don't see that as sculpture.

[laughter]

Michael Zarin, attorney for GDC: Art is in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. Lozito: We could put a smiley face on it or something.

Boardmember O'Reilly: A little statuette.

Mr. Lozito: Obviously, it doesn't make sense to go the Zoning Board for something like this. So if we can't get people to accept that we would probably just, [unfortunately] eliminate it. So I'll let you think about it. I don't need an answer right now.

I just want to show you – since this is a hearing not only on the subdivision and site plans, it's also on the steep slope aspect of things – this is just a depiction of where the steep slopes are on the site and where the disturbance lies. You can see, this is the disturbance line here. So this area is undisturbed, this are *is* disturbed. On Lot 1 we do not disturb any steep slopes at all. On Lot 2, where the affordable building is, we do a little disturbance for grading here and a little disturbance where the back of the building is. On Lot C, the only disturbance is right ... this is where the corner of Building C would be. I'm going to show, this is the erosion control plan. It shows you where the buildings are in relation to that disturbance line.

So here's that one area of steep slope disturbance here. There's a little bit of disturbance here and a little bit of disturbance here. So this layout really went a long way. I think we're at 0.058 acres of steep slope disturbance – it's very small – on a 7.5-acre site. If you look at the chart on the steep slope plan you'll see that the allowable disturbances are not exceeded so we're in good shape there.

Then last, maybe not least – maybe least – this is the subdivision plat which looks very much like the site plan actually, where we just tried to add some of the requisite signature blocks and what have. We have the metes and bounds on those lots that were shown on the site plan. We reference the cross-easements on there. We've shown some of the existing easements more clearly. That's basically what that does. The number of existing easements, we've highlighted them. The cross-easements, I'm not quite sure how we'll define that. It may just be a blanket easement. Instead of trying to define things by metes and bounds, it may just be a broad description of those.

I think that's it, pretty much, for all the things that are required for subdivision in terms of grading and utility. All that stuff is covered in the site plan aspect of it so I think we've got everything covered. Do you have any questions?

Chairman Cameron: Well, a couple things and then we'll do questions.

One is, we do want to send this over to our Architectural Review Board. So do you have separate copies to give them, or what have you?

Mr. Lozito: What I was thinking, maybe I would do an informal presentation to them.

Chairman Cameron: Well, that's up to them what they want to do. Last time there was a good presentation. And, in fact, you showed up with materials to show them what it was like. And, in fact, they brought materials back here, if you go through the minutes. I think they're going to want to see what the materials are. They'll have their comments on it, I'm sure. But I do think we'd like to hear from them and we'd like you to go see them.

Mr. Lozito: Yeah, that's what I was saying. Do an informal presentation.

Village Attorney Stecich: Why an informal presentation, when it's required by the code?

Mr. Lozito: It's required for the building permit. So my understanding ...

[cross-talk]

Village Attorney Stecich: If you read it, it says if anything requires site plan approval it has to get sent to the ARB before final ...

Mr. Lozito: Well, that would require us to have to complete materials and everything selected, so ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: That was actually referenced in the previous presentation, when you were getting approval in 2007.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, you did go to them.

Mr. Lozito: Yeah, I wasn't here for that so I don't ...

Village Attorney Stecich: The code requires it.

Chairman Cameron: We were [temporary] doing something else. You were referred to us.

Village Attorney Stecich: It's Section 101-13(c): *"If an application for a building permit requires action by the Planning Board, the ARB shall consult with, and advise, the Planning Board regarding the application prior to such action."*

Mr. Lozito: Right, "consult and advise," but they don't have to have formal approval at that point.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I have it that they need to approve the building design and report to the Planning Board. That was in the minutes of September, 2007 for your proposal back then.

Mr. Lozito: So doesn't that say "consult" ...

Village Attorney Stecich: It's not an informal presentation. You have to go to the ARB and do whatever they want.

Mr. Zarin: You just said that they have ...

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Use the mic.

Mr. Zarin: I think what you were thinking is, they have to give their approval. But I think you agree. They have to make a referral to the Planning Board.

[cross-talk]

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Got to use the mic.

Mr. Lozito: I was going to make a presentation so they could report back to you, but I'm not expecting them to approve it at that point, right?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, I believe they would need to approve the architectural plan that you propose at that time, and refer it to us in their report.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: But they can do it in two phases. They can do the preliminary – with design and all that – and then they can do the color and the exact type of window and the design.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know, the only thing is, those are issues that I believe might be relevant to the Planning Board's approval. Because a recurrent theme in the SEQRA findings was this building was consistent with the corner that it's on. And it is across the building from it and, architecturally, a very significant building, if the Planning Board cares to. So that's why the input from the ARB would be helpful for the Board.

Mr. Lozito: No, I ... their next meeting, I think, is on February 6. Would we be able to get it before them?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Let me just check the calendar. One moment. The next ARB meeting is on February 3.

Mr. Lozito: There is?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: And you would have to have the submission in by the 20th, which is Monday. Put you under the gun again, Bruce. But as you know, that's flexible.

[laughter]

Mr. Lozito: Since this is a review and a referral, right?, from the Planning Board ...

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Oh, if it's a little bit later on in that week I'm sure it'll be OK.

Mr. Lozito: OK, well, I want to go home and start working on it.

[laughter]

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: It's supposed to be in by the 20th for the third meeting ... for the meeting on the 3rd of February.

Mr. Lozito: OK.

Chairman Cameron: The other thing is that we'd like to do a site visit. And I think, Marianne, you're aware of that? We don't want to make it that complicated [unintelligible] a number of [stakes] to find the corners of the building. Four stakes showing us where the lot lines are, you know, and something showing us where the Village land is. I mean, that's the way we'll look at it.

Mr. Lozito: I was going to ask you if you might think this is more helpful to you. What we did was, we superimposed the site plan over the existing [unintelligible].

Chairman Cameron: but I want to go out and see it on the ground.

Mr. Lozito: Well, I mean, it shows where the curb line for the paved parking area is right where the building starts. So I don't know if this is ... this is probably more useful to you so you could see exactly ... see, this is the existing [unintelligible] here, and you could see Building B.

Chairman Cameron: I just think we want stakes in the ground.

Mr. Lozito: Approximate?

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, I'm not going to hold you ...

Mr. Lozito: I'm going to get that plan to you folks because I think it would be useful for you to have when you're ... have it for the rest of the Board.

Chairman Cameron: And we need ...

[cross-talk]

Mr. Lozito: When do you think that would be?

Chairman Cameron: Well, I think sometime before our next meeting would be good, and sometime in the ... ask everyone to bring their calendars. I didn't ask you guys to bring your calendars ...

Mr. Lozito: I have my calendar.

Chairman Cameron: You know, sometime ... I'm actually not going to be back until the 2nd of February, but sometime between the 2nd and when we have our meeting would be good to do that. If we could possibly do it on a weekend, that would be the best time, I think, for everybody. I think it's very important we walk across the property.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Yeah, we don't go at night.

[laughter]

Chairman Cameron: We'll pick a date before the end, or try to pick a date.

Village Attorney Stecich: [We miss] our February meeting, so we wouldn't have that [unintelligible]?

Mr. Lozito: That's the 20th, it looks like.

Chairman Cameron: The 20th.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: OK.

Mr. Lozito: So you have the 8th and the 15th.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yeah, it's the 20th.

Mr. Lozito: Saturday the 8th or Saturday the 15th? You'd like to attend, of course.

Chairman Cameron: I'd be good for both of those. Maybe I'll go twice.

Mr. Lozito: [Might] come back alive.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Are we saying the 8th?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: The weekend? That would be hard to work around.

Chairman Cameron: Well, that's all right. You could ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I could go myself.

Chairman Cameron: Yourself, or actually I'm sure one of us could go a second time to go with you. That's fine. I mean, I'll be happy to go a second time. I'm retired. Having done it, I can go a second time. And my kids will have the house.

[laughter]

Did anyone else have a vote on the 8th?

Boardmember O'Reilly: The 8th is good for me, or 15th.

Boardmember Alligood: I think the 8th would probably be better for me.

Chairman Cameron: Can you get the stakes in by the 8th?

Mr. Zarin: Yeah, we can do that.

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't need to be there.

Chairman Cameron: So what time do we want to do it?

Boardmember O'Reilly: I'll start with 2 o'clock.

Chairman Cameron: At least I didn't pick Super Bowl.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Oh, when is that?

Chairman Cameron: I don't know. It's either the 9th or ...

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: They're talking about the 8th.

Chairman Cameron: Yes.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Doing it on the 8th now.

Chairman Cameron: Does 2 p.m. work, or do people want to get it over and done at 10 in the morning or something?

Boardmember O'Reilly: Ten in the morning? Yeah.

Chairman Cameron: I mean, just so we don't ...

[cross-talk]

OK, 10 a.m.? We want to get a little sunlight. OK.

Mr. Lozito: Want a rain date?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: How about the 15th for the rain date? Is that OK with you?

Chairman Cameron: That's fine with me. Fifteenth, at the same time?

Boardmember O'Reilly: Yeah.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Rain or snow date, should we say?

Village Attorney Stecich: Buddy, just post a notice down on the bulletin board downstairs that it's on Saturday so you know [unintelligible]. The truth is, you're not transacting business and you're just looking. It's not a meeting anyway. But just [get somebody to say] ...

Mr. Zarin: There's case law in there ...

Village Attorney Stecich: I know.

Mr. Zarin: ... that we lost.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Stecich: I just read it the other day.

Chairman Cameron: The other thing, and maybe this is you, I want to have a copy of the drawings put in the library.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: OK, we have an extra copy downstairs. I'll talk to Sue tomorrow or Monday and square it away with her.

Boardmember Ambrozek: That would be Sue Fier, correct?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes, sir.

Chairman Cameron: So most of those are sort of housekeeping. Now we go to the issues people want to bring up. [Any points]?

Boardmember Alligood: I want to say that I like what you did with the pavers, the treatment, especially not only where the parking is but to create the sense that they're actually crosswalks.

Mr. Lozito: Right.

Boardmember Alligood: I think that really helps break the massive driveway.

Mr. Lozito: Yeah, thanks. Martin Ginsburg was very sensitive to the pavement thing, so that was a way to ...

Chairman Cameron: How about pavers for the visitors parking? Could that be a possibility, or a good idea?

Boardmember Ambrozek: You mean in the public space.

Chairman Cameron: I don't know, I mean I'm not trying to force you to spend money. But that's why we're trying to get rid of permeable spaces. Makes the whole thing [accessible].

Boardmember O'Reilly: There's a tendency, though, if you make it look the same is that everybody'll think it *is* the same. But it's public land.

Mr. Lozito: That's a good point. It might be good to differentiate a little bit.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I have a question, actually, on the parking, then, on that topic. Is all the parking that is not in the garage space public parking?

Mr. Lozito: No. There are 35 parking spaces in each garage. So the parking in front of the buildings also is part of the residential parking count. This parking here is the parking for the affordable building, and then this is additional resident parking. There's a factor in there for visitor parking also in the total. But basically, that's the required parking for that building, the required parking for that building, and the required parking for that building. And the public spaces are here.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Right. But my question is, those spaces, although they're required for Buildings A, B and C, are they assigned to any particular units, or can anybody ...

Mr. Lozito: I think what we'll probably do – because these are the only spaces for the affordables – is that we'd probably assign those so they're assured of their spaces. We might be a little more flexible with this parking so visitors could use it as well as the residents.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, because you have the proverbial birthday party and the five cars show up.

Mr. Lozito: Right. That's where all the garage spaces would be reserved, of course. But these would be more flexible, except for the affordables. That's theirs and they would be designated as such.

Chairman Cameron: I notice you had a thing about putting future facilities for car chargers, electric car chargers, in the basement. Have you got an idea for – maybe they won't have any – the affordable people who might end up getting a Prius?

Mr. Lozito: If we had to we could probably put a station outside. But I think the Green Code requires about 23 spaces overall. We could have a trunk line, so to speak, of electrical power that could be tapped into. If somebody wants an electric charging space they could tap into that. And if an affordable unit had an issue like that we could probably do an outdoor version of that.

Chairman Cameron: Right, yeah.

One thing I noted, which the best I can tell doesn't make any difference. But it's just a line which I think is in error. It's not a map diagram. You have set up the 50-foot side yard – we'll call it "side yard," even though that's not what it is – line there. If you read the rules technically on whether you can have paving in a side yard, you find that you can only have paving in a side yard if it's being used to access your property. That paving sitting there, which you are going to give an easement to the man to the north, is actually ...

Mr. Lozito: Sorry, to which?

Chairman Cameron: That right there, that is not actually providing access to your building. I think if you measure it you'll find that you're still OK. You still have 50 feet left before you hit the side off Building A. But I see a line in this I think is wrong. If you could check the law I think you'll find you need to move the line. It has no effect on you, and it's just something. I looked at it, and you're OK. I've been wrong before.

One thing in the planning plan which just ... and I know this because I come from a place in New York in the Adirondacks which has more white pines than probably anyplace you could think of. And I have six of them in my backyard. They are, incidentally, the tallest tree in the eastern United States. I think, quite candidly, just from looking 20 or 30 years forward ... and they also have this bad habit, in a wind, of dropping very large branches. For some reason, you are putting about 14 of them right next to your parking out there on the berm. I would just suggest ... it's a wonderful tree, but when it gets to be about 80 or 90 feet tall and starts dropping branches – and we won't be around, of course – it will ruin a lot of cars. It's a wonderful native plan, so it's approved. But I just think we need to look at some of those things just to make sure we ...

Village Attorney Stecich: Jamie, that's a good point. You happen to know about white pines. But I think you probably need a landscape ... if there's somebody ... unless somebody on the Board ... Kathy, are you a landscape ...

Boardmember Sullivan: No, I'm not.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, it's probably important to have a landscape professional take a look at it. I don't think that's within the Green Code stuff.

Chairman Cameron: No, it's not.

Village Attorney Stecich: There's different sets of questions in terms of ...

Mr. Zarin: Jim was a landscape architect.

Village Attorney Stecich: Right, but I think ...

Chairman Cameron: How long do you want your project delayed anyway?

[laughter]

Village Attorney Stecich: Things may or not be on the Village's list. I mean, that's one step. But then the other thing is just to make sure that the right landscaping ... which, like I said, you happen to know that. I've seen it a lot in Irvington. When the landscape people look at it, they point out why this isn't going to work for this reason or that reason. But you need a really specialized knowledge of that. So it's probably a good idea to have a landscape professional take a look at it.

Boardmember Alligood: But I, too, just have one other comment. It struck me on the elevation, where we saw the road trees, just that I don't know if it exactly matches the plan. It's meant to just ...

Mr. Zarin: No.

Boardmember Alligood: I was going to say, because it's too even.

Mr. Zarin: This was [off-mic].

Boardmember Alligood: I think that's not what's it's going to look like. But if that is the plan, I would ask that would be made to look more natural.

Mr. Zarin: [off-mic] as we describe.

Mr. Lozito: That's not nature?

[laughter]

Chairman Cameron: They got most of the [unintelligible] in there, though.

Boardmember Alligood: Soldiers in a line there.

Village Attorney Stecich: I think it's up to not them, but to this board, to pick out a landscape person to take a look at it. The plans may ... it's important that they be deer-resistant.

Boardmember Sullivan: Such a sad thing to say, but so good.

Village Attorney Stecich: Immunocontraception [unintelligible]. But you're still going to have the Ardsley deer. We have so many deer here.

Boardmember Ambrozek: In terms of deer, one can protect the young plants until they are mature and tall enough to look after themselves. You don't have to choose deer-resistant plants. You can choose ones that will grow and still survive.

Boardmember Sullivan: One concern I have had is the ownership costs that the affordable housing building will have immediately [inaudible]. So when I saw the dividing line going right through the new communal area – you know, half of it's on the for-profit side and half of it's on the affordable side – is this a cross-easement situation, or should that line maybe move? And also, there's some underground stormwater infrastructure that's crossing into that property. And again, I'm just concerned about the affordable housing. If some organization ends up being the owner of that, having the expenses come to maintain things that are ...

Mr. Lozito: Well, you may recall that two conditions were imposed so the big-ticket items would be borne by the market rate units, one of which is the whole stormwater management system. Then the other is the pedestrian bridge and the public parking. So really, what remains for the affordable is some lawn-cutting, maybe some maintenance of this, but ...

Boardmember Sullivan: See, that's ... I would like to just bring that up as a concern to the Board that I would like to minimize any of these other types of expenses for maintenance. The other one coincides ... because this is [unintelligible] space come back and having it be shown ...

Chairman Cameron: And being on their property.

Boardmember Sullivan: And being on their property line. But I also have a concern about maintaining the Saw Mill riverbank and wondering if there's a flood, if there's some kind of future flood provisions that are going to be required by the town. I would like to think about ways to take that burden of maintaining a riverbank away from an affordable housing [owner].

Mr. Lozito: It's a stabilized bank right now. It has been.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'm just personally [unintelligible] in dealing with consequences of Sandy. And I'm just looking down the road a little bit, and just throw that out there as a future ...

Mr. Lozito: Let us give it some thought. I'm going to try to come up with some sort of a fair share approach to this, the cost of maintenance. Yeah, we do want to have one entity managing the entire property so it's a uniform level of care, and some sort of a fair allocation of the cost. You remember, Ginsburg is going to own all three of these. And maybe, maybe the Village will own this Village housing affordable development fund company – may own this in the future. But that's not a certainty. GDC may choose to own it for the long term. So it's not like this is going to become a public responsibility necessarily. And he's got the same interest in keeping the cost down.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I got a couple comments, but not about what you pointed out. Yeah, we now have about 75, 79 feet between Buildings A and B, and then we have 114 feet between Buildings B and C. It's roughly in there. One way of ... one thing that occurred to me is that ... and it looks ... I think it's wonderful [unintelligible]. I think the layout's very nice. But one thing that occurred to me is if we took Building B and rotated it very slightly counterclockwise, you could then push it about 10 feet closer to Building C and still not hit the ...

Mr. Lozito: No, I'm hitting steep slopes. This is really ... Chairman, this is where we put it for you.

Chairman Cameron: Well, that's why we ...

Mr. Lozito: Can we stop now (laughing)?

Chairman Cameron: No, that's fine. But what we asked for was a gazebo in the area, but we went ahead and focused on the fact there was going to be ...

[cross-talk]

Mr. Lozito: We ...

Chairman Cameron: ... [unintelligible] between B and C.

Mr. Lozito: We're also pinched with a [unintelligible] trunk sewer easement line.

Chairman Cameron: Well, that's why you rotate it slightly counterclockwise. And then it'll slide right along.

Boardmember Alligood: I'd rather move on from moving buildings.

[laughter]

I personally think we've done that enough. I really think we should move on from that and just focus on the other things.

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't think it would probably be a huge deal for Building A. The cost of the gazebo's not going to be huge. So you might roll it into some of your other stuff.

Mr. Lozito: It's starting to add up, but we'll think about it. It's starting to add up.

Village Attorney Stecich: Assume the maintenance responsibility. You don't really [unintelligible]. They're going to have an agreement where they're assuming a lot of the other maintenance responsibility. Maybe they can toss the gazebo into it.

Mr. Zarin: There's a real theory in these types of things also that if they're shared amenities you want people [off-mic] something because they have more of a vested interest in maintaining it. Not a high [unintelligible], but things you use on a daily basis.

Village Attorney Stecich: On the other hand, you got to come to agreement. And if the one party says fine with me and the other party thinks they would like it fixed up, you get nowhere. So it cuts both ways.

Boardmember Sullivan: And kind of in concept, the preferred place for the affordable units would have been within the buildings themselves. So it's not that this is a separate building as our first choice. It's where we've ended up for some very good reasons from the developer's point of view. So I don't think ... I don't really see it as an equal owner in the scheme of things. It's basically a building that was created out of necessity.

One thought I wanted to bring – and this, Jamie, because you guys were part of this before, and Marianne – thinking about utilities, wondering if the Village would like to have utilities run to [unintelligible] open space. I don't know if any past thought about programming that space for the Village's perspective. Would it make sense to have electrical brought there, water brought there, not stubbed up to be tapped into. Just thinking a little bit down the road for future flexibility. I don't know who [unintelligible] talk to about what might occur on that property from the Village's perspective, since it'll be gaining it as a park.

The other thought, too – and, again, it's a little bit because of one of the earlier applications – I almost want to see the property line that runs east-west along the access road between Building C and the Village's property to be moved a little bit south so it would be a buffer on Building C's property. So moving that whatever, 5 feet or something, to the south so Building C has a buffer that they're maintaining between the parking and the open space.

Chairman Cameron: That would reduce the parking.

Boardmember Sullivan: Again, that might reduce the amount of the park, but what's that park built in for? Is that a problem if it's increased since the last [unintelligible]?

Chairman Cameron: You could be in charge of going back to the Board of Trustees and telling them we just made the park smaller. But I agree with you on the [unintelligible].

Boardmember Sullivan: Again, it's just a number unless it's attached to it. And I see an advantage that there's going to be a landscaped buffer between parking and the Village's park.

Boardmember Alligood: Which parking?

Mr. Lozito: She's talking about having a 5-foot strip here ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Yeah.

Mr. Lozito: ... between the open space and the public parking.

Chairman Cameron: Well, we need to look at that. Because your august leader has talked about the idea of a great lawn. So I'm not sure if he wants the ...

Mr. Lozito: I don't know if you want to separate this from this. These people will be using it also.

Chairman Cameron: I would point out that the best I could tell from looking at the diagrams there's no curbing, for some reason, on the edge of your ... and maybe I didn't have a good enough diagram. My eyes aren't good enough. There seemed to be no curbing or division between our future park and your road.

Mr. Lozito: It looks like the curb is right where the property line is. It's covered by the boundary.

Chairman Cameron: But I think the idea of having access to water and [inaudible] I would think that, quite frankly, you guys would want it, too. Because between the period of time while you're trying to sell these units you don't want to be looking out to a stark yellow mass with no water you need it to keep the grass looking nice. So you might want to put the pipe in and connect it to yours, and later on if we start doing something there ...

Mr. Lozito: Well, in the way of bureaucracy, if we had two properties served by a single line it has to be a public main. So we could maybe bring a service line from the main. But I'd have to find out if United Water is the company that provides the water, whether they'll let you stub it without a known use. I'm not sure if they will. I have to find out.

Village Attorney Stecich: Then put a water fountain in.

[laughter]

Boardmember Sullivan: But I think the point I'd like to bring is perhaps we should have someone in the Rec Department or Board of Trustees to help us understand what this program might be for this.

Village Attorney Stecich: I thought it came up last time and they had no use for it. No, not they had no use for it. They had no ...

Chairman Cameron: Probably no current use and no current money.

Mr. Lozito: Well, they're going to have money when we pay our rent fee.

Chairman Cameron: But I would love to hear back from you guys, because you're looking at this, whether there's a way we can get water and potentially electricity there.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I think there's a safety risk of having electricity being delivered to a property that does not have any use for it. I know that if a building gets damaged you have to have the electricity disconnected.

Chairman Cameron: Right.

Boardmember Ambrozek: So I see that definitely being difficult.

Mr. Zarin: All right, well, let us get back to you [and we'll go into it].

Chairman Cameron: That would be great.

Boardmember Sullivan: One last thing, Jamie, just to ...

Chairman Cameron: Please.

Boardmember Sullivan: The little area ... and, again, I didn't focus on some of the concept plan, but the sort of jut-out that goes below the parking over to the bridge. Why exactly is that happening?

Mr. Lozito: That was to preserve all of these trees and create some additional river frontage for the parcel. Before, the pedestrian bridge just came straight down across the river, and it was taking out trees on both sides. So we wanted to move this to the most appropriate, least-impactful location.

Boardmember Sullivan: My question is in the timing of that bridge. Will we be looking to have that bridge be placed in the course of this project, and we get the permits and whatnot with the county?

Mr. Lozito: It would be during the construction of this project.

Boardmember Sullivan: OK.

Chairman Cameron: One of the questions, obviously, is ... because I know you have to go, or you thought you had to go, to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or someone like that for ...

Mr. Lozito: We may not, depending on where these abutments go.

Chairman Cameron: Because we really want to see that thing finished as the buildings are getting occupied, as I'm sure you're aware.

Mr. Lozito: Yeah.

Chairman Cameron: I happened to notice in the minutes of the 2007 discussion that there was some concern on your part that you might not be allowed to have a berm along 9-A because the county might say it impedes the drainage of water off our road. Maybe you've taken care of that, but I'm just curious where you are in ... and I'm not trying to raise that as an issue. I'm just trying to bring ...

Mr. Lozito: What happened, we actually have solved that because in the previous plan the berm was actually on the state right of way part of it. This thing was thinner, so part of it had to be on the state right of way and we had to get the state's permission. Now that's all on our own property so we don't have that issue.

Chairman Cameron: OK. But there is a way of the water coming off the road to come into someone's [unintelligible].

Mr. Lozito: Yep, we're going to pick that up.

Chairman Cameron: All right. And I've just noticed there's only a ... on one of the diagrams I looked up there was only a partial berm on the south end of the property; the so-called ... yeah, there you are. And that may be sufficient, but I just wanted to point it out to the rest of the members of the Board. We asked, and we thought it would be a good idea, to have a berm down there. And that's why it's there. Well, maybe I brought it up – someone brought it up – and I think it's a good idea because I think it keeps kids in. When they're playing in the field, the berm slows down getting [run over] the road. They didn't do it for the entire [unintelligible], I guess, in part because there's a lot of pipes going through there. But I just thought we should ...

Mr. Lozito: Is that something you're sure you want to see? We showed it there because you had asked for it.

Chairman Cameron: Right. That's why I bring it up.

Mr. Lozito: Because I just don't know. Does it take away from the utility of the rest of the parcel?

Chairman Cameron: Well, I think it gives it some privacy and it gives it some feeling of being in the country rather than right next to a highway with cars racing by, which is one reason why it's a good idea.

All right, I have another one, which is I now know, since you told me, what that alleyway in the [full rentals] are. How do people in the affordable units get rid of their trash?

Mr. Lozito: They have to bring it to the refuse area here.

Chairman Cameron: So they have to come out the front door and go ...

Mr. Lozito: There's one central station for the pickup.

Boardmember Alligood: We have Sue Smith here, from the Affordable Housing Committee. I don't know, is there anything you wanted to bring to our attention or have any questions on? Not to put you on the spot, I just wanted to give you an opportunity because you've been here all night.

Sue Smith, Affordable Housing Committee: Actually, that was one of my questions was where the trash was going to go. That was it, at this point.

Chairman Cameron: My rule, life rule in life, is that if you make it too hard for people to do it, they don't and you [head out] with a different solution.

[laughter]

Ms. Smith: Well, I think the people who live here, they'll have at least one car. I live at River Glen and there are two trash receptacles – one on each end – one on the south and one on the north. People drive. When they're leaving, they just drive by the trash receptacle and put it in and then drive on out. That seems to work OK for a lot of people so I don't think it's a hardship. But it also means you don't have a big piece of paving and a big trash corral breaking up the attractive symmetry of it. Granted it's a practical thing,

Chairman Cameron: Well, I understand, for the two [full-rent] buildings, evidently the superintendent on the assigned day takes it out of the basement and puts it in the ... do you have a place in the basement to put it? He takes it out of the basement and puts it in the ...

Mr. Lozito: These buildings are going to have compacters because they're bigger. So that will be a heavier load that somebody couldn't really carry. So that'll have to be a golf cart type of thing.

Chairman Cameron: All right. Just out of curiosity, on the diagrams you had – but, interesting, only for the affordable building – little materials. We're going to learn this from the ARB because they're going to learn more of it from you. You had vinyl windows. Are these vinyl-clad windows?

Mr. Lozito: Yes.

Chairman Cameron: And they're going throughout all three buildings, the metal-clad? All right. And do the windows slide open? When you look at the diagram – the nice thing about having electronic copies is you can blow them up and blow them up – it looks like the windows slide.

Mr. Lozito: To be honest with you, I don't know. Looks like they do. I will ask about that.

Chairman Cameron: OK. And the mechanical systems, are they going on the roof? Is that where you're putting them? I know where the electrical closet's going, my favorite place. But the mechanicals, are they going on the roof, or what are you doing?

Mr. Lozito: We're going to look at that. We have an opportunity to put them on the roof because we do have areas that we have some clearance between the height plane and the roof. So we have to look at that further.

Chairman Cameron: Just while you're working on the medallions – and while you're talking to the ARB, by the way – you read our old minutes you'll find the ARB made you reduce the height of the parapet last time. So they didn't think it was necessary.

Village Attorney Stecich: But it is important to show the mechanicals.

Mr. Zarin: Yeah, but they haven't seen the sculpture. This could be a whole [new game].

[laughter]

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Well, the parapet does have to be a certain height, as per state code.

Village Attorney Stecich: A sculpture of Martin's head.

Chairman Cameron: Right. But anyway, they thought 4 feet was too high. Brought it down to [unintelligible]?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Brought it down to what?

Chairman Cameron: Two feet.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: That's not state code. I think state code is 3 feet.

Chairman Cameron: Well, you can check that.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Oh, we'll check all that. We'll visit that.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Well, if you want someone to call it a sculpture I'll call it a sculpture. Because I think it needs something, the roofline.

Chairman Cameron: He wants his profile put in the middle.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Stecich: You know how [unintelligible] they have these buildings with the faces like carved out. Put Martin's face there.

Mr. Lozito: I was just going to say, you might end up with a bust of Martin.

Boardmember O'Reilly: If you don't put the mechanicals on the roof what are your options?

Mr. Lozito: Underground.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Behind the buildings?

Mr. Lozito: Yeah, around the perimeter, screened with landscaping.

Mr. Zarin: [off-mic] New York City.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Use the microphone, please.

Mr. Zarin: When you go through New York City and you look at the gargoyles on residential places, many of them are replicas of ... they were done by Italian stone masons, and they're replicas of people they knew that the people who they were building the buildings for didn't know. But they built these gargoyles, and then added the spiritual aspect. But they're really people that these people knew in the Old World, and we could do something like that.

[laughter]

Mr. Lozito: The Mayor, Martin, and the Chairman.

[laughter]

Chairman Cameron: I think Sue Smith gets all four corners of the affordable.

[laughter]

Last time, you explained to us how the road was being ... the width of the road was being dealt with. But last time, the Fire Department got you to put in sort of Grasscrete™ pavers so they could bring the truck around the back of the building [unintelligible].

Mr. Lozito: They had [unintelligible], apparently. No, they just wanted a level area back there.

Chairman Cameron: And last time they insisted on it because the problem was that they couldn't get [half] the units on the road side of the building, but they couldn't easily get to the units on the non-road side if they had to rescue somebody from a three-story building. So they had to put pavers in. At least that's what the minutes say.

Mr. Lozito: That wasn't on the plan, I don't think. But they [didn't] ask for that. They noted that they couldn't get their truck right in here from that side, so they ...

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yeah, there's no apparatus access needed in the back of this building as per state code, but it has to be a flat, even surface for them to put ground ladders. And that's what they agreed to.

Chairman Cameron: They also had closets where they could put the ladders for the rescue equipment.

Boardmember Ambrozek: That was removed and was going to be replaced by water rescue equipment.

Chairman Cameron: Right, correct. But [unintelligible]?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yeah, they didn't need them.

Chairman Cameron: All right, I think I'm finished with my questions for this now.

Village Attorney Stecich: I just want ... and this would be part ... and you may have it on there. We said that during site plan review we'd go through the details on pesticide and herbicide use.

Mr. Lozito: I have to get that.

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't know if you got that on your last statement. But I would say get that to us sooner rather than later.

Mr. Lozito: Yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: So that can be reviewed by the landscape person, as well.

Mr. Lozito: That was one other thing that ...

Village Attorney Stecich: And you were also supposed to have a no-mow zone, a 40- to 50-foot strip behind the buildings along the river.

Mr. Lozito: That was based on a prior plan, so it'll probably be a little different. We'll show it on this landscape plan, but we're thinking an area like this behind the buildings. It would be like a meadow, actually, with flowers and that kind of thing. So there'd be some manicured lawn so you have access to the buildings, and then there would be sort of a more free-flowing meadow type grass.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, but you should get that to the Board as soon as possible. There's no point sending it to the landscape person until you send a complete package.

Mr. Lozito: I don't know if the landscape guy will know the pesticide thing because my landscape guy did not – or the landscape architect.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, I think whoever we get for landscape should be somebody who's familiar with plants along the river and stuff like that. And if they are, they're going to be familiar with pesticides and herbicides; your regular landscape architect. But because of the sensitivity of this site, you're going to have to get somebody who knows about these things along the river.

Chairman Cameron: All right. So we need to hire [unintelligible].

Boardmember Ambrozek: OK, I have several points I'd like to raise, please. The first point I'd like to raise I don't think is something that the Planning Board actually can address. I'd just like to put it as a request. In the Affordable Housing Plan, SPA-7, where you show the interior for the layouts, most of the kitchens are interior kitchens. There are, however, two kitchens – one on the first floor, one on the second floor – that are on an exterior wall. I believe they're the north wall, to the right. Yes, that's the second floor one, and the corresponding one on the first floor. Those are an exterior wall. I think they're facing north and it would be nice if they could have a window instead of having a solid wall. I just know one spends a lot of time in the kitchen and it would be nice if the kitchen allowed you to look out. I don't know what the design layout for the cabinets is proposed so that's just a suggestion.

Looking at drainage, on Plan DE-1 you say that there's a 24-inch RCP drain, and that it's to be relocated. However, there's no indication of where it's going to be relocated.

Mr. Lozito: There should be. It should wrap around the building. This section here?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes.

Mr. Lozito: It's going to go like this.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Ah, OK. And that becomes, then, part ... does that become? Oh, that will go into the bioretention system. OK, good.

You designate some signs: one sign for the public area, and then there's a sign for what you call the "property architectural sign."

Mr. Lozito: Right, there's one here and one ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: Right. What are the dimensions of each of those signs? Do you have that?

Mr. Lozito: They're on the detail?

Boardmember Ambrozek: I could not figure them out.

Mr. Lozito: I don't have that sheet with me.

Village Attorney Stecich: [unintelligible].

Boardmember Alligood: S-1: 3 feet by 2 feet.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I think 3 foot by 2 foot was for the public property sign. It wasn't for the architectural ...

Mr. Lozito: On another detail sheet.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Back here, wasn't it?

Mr. Lozito: D – what was it, did you say?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, you reference the signs on S-1. I don't know if there's a different detail sheet that would say the dimensions.

Mr. Lozito: There it is, Saw Mill Lofts.

Boardmember Alligood: [3-D4]? This?

Mr. Lozito: Yeah. That's a stone wall with a sign.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, but which sign are you talking about, Michael?

Boardmember Ambrozek: If you look on S-1, the entrance ...

Village Attorney Stecich: I know, but which sign?

Mr. Lozito: Look on D-4.

Chairman Cameron: Lots of signs on D-4.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Oh, D-4.

Chairman Cameron: You mean "the Lofts at Saw Mill River?"

Mr. Lozito: Where it says "The Loft at Saw Mill?"

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes, I see it now.

Mr. Lozito: It says mostly wall, with a little bit of sign.

Boardmember Ambrozek: So it's approximately 6 foot 8 by 4 foot.

Mr. Lozito: Roughly.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Another question I have is, you've described all the plantings for the three lots where you'll be building. However, you do not describe any of the plantings for the public space, and there should be at least ... I don't think one could leave it as bare ground. There needs to be some sort of ...

Mr. Lozito: We were going to ... we have a large area of pavement we were going to remove and then put grass. It could be meadow grass, too.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Anyway, I would just look for ... I'm just looking for, in your planting diagram, planter lists to have what you're proposing there, please.

It's very nice to see that you've been studying the Green Code and that you're going to propose a bicycle rack. My thought on that is kind of similar to the thinking on the garbage. That is, it would be, again, nice if there was a bicycle rack – considering the extensiveness of the development, that it's really quite a wide development – perhaps a bicycle rack adjacent to each building would be appropriate; certainly, perhaps, near the driveway to Building A and somewhere around the front corner or just slightly out of the view next to Building B.

Mr. Lozito: We'll look at that.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Thank you.

Again, all these buildings will have flat roofs. And as I mentioned when we were talking about the Washington street development, I would hope that you would be able to take the water and capture it somehow for use with irrigation.

Mr. Lozito: Well, we're going to use it ... it has to go to the bioretention basins for filtration. That's basically what we do.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, not all water has to go to ... I mean, you can also put it into storage tanks, so long as either of the storage tanks can be drained in anticipation of when the water would freeze. Or if it's kept below ground, the ground will prevent it from freezing and then you can pump it for use for irrigation.

Mr. Lozito: I'll bring it back to them. I'm not sure I can respond to that.

Boardmember Ambrozek: And one of the areas that could be used for that storage ... I was looking at the spaces allocated for parking under Buildings A and C, and on one side – they're very deep, they're about 25 feet deep, which is ... it almost allows for tandem parking. And this is something ... we don't want to see tandem parking.

Mr. Lozito: Why not? It was not for required parking, it's just extra space where people could put bicycles, they could put a motorcycle, they could put a number of things.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, we've had discussions before. This is why I was thinking that if one actually had a use for those extra 5, 6 feet of depth there could be storage for use by the residents of those buildings. Or as I said, it could be underground water storage for irrigation rather than having depth of parking spaces. Keep the parking spaces to the north sort of 18-foot depth.

Mr. Lozito: Well, we'd like to have the flexibility, to be honest, to use them for other things. Could be storage for the tenants; it could be, like I said, a motorcycle, a bicycle. We really want to keep its flexibility for use. There's 27 units in the building. I'm not quite sure how it will be divided out. They may have to pay a higher charge to get a tandem space or a larger space.

Chairman Cameron: I was puzzling. Previously, I thought you had storage units in the back of them all. You have eight units, so they were sort of centered.

Mr. Lozito: We did. And Marty feels strongly that that he needs the flexibility more than the storage; the units are so large that there's no shortage of storage in the units themselves.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Talking about the two driveways you have, and looking at the previous minutes, will you need to get New York State Department of Transportation approval for those?

Mr. Lozito: Yes.

Boardmember Ambrozek: A lot of my remaining questions have already been addressed. Mr. Chairman, the issue of the water rescue equipment was on page 25 and 44 of the September 2007 minutes.

Chairman Cameron: That was reversed later?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes, it was reversed. In those minutes they were reversed, and GDC proposed providing a sum of about \$18,000 for water rescue equipment instead of fire protection closets. Yes, they reversed the fire protection closets.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Since that time, we now carry a certain amount of water rescue equipment on the rig, where at that time we didn't. So that may be a difference in today. But because the Fire Chief didn't bring it up when they had the meeting with GDC, I'm not sure if that's still going to be a necessity anymore.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, this was reviewed by the ... didn't you meet with the Fire Department already?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes, they didn't mention anything about that.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, so whatever ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: I was just trying to clarify a previous point of discussion.

One thing that was discussed, and I just want to make it clear we still feel this way, is that there should be no signage to inhibit access to any of the public space.

Mr. Lozito: Of course.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Then I noted – this was, apparently, an interesting piece of discussion – that continuing jurisdiction on the site plan after it's approved for the MUPDD development would remain with the Planning Board for Saw Mill River Lofts. That was on page 45 of the September 2007 minutes, as well.

Mr. Lozito: Yeah, that's your code. That's the code requirement.

Chairman Cameron: OK.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Oh, at what stage should we be getting input from the surrounding communities – from Dobbs Ferry, Ardsley, the Town of Greenburgh?

Mr. Lozito: We sent notices to them for this hearing.

Boardmember Ambrozek: OK.

Chairman Cameron: It'll all probably show up or not show up at a future period. A lot of them show up at the first one.

I think that's it for this meeting. We look forward to seeing you on the 8th or whatever day that was.

Mr. Lozito: We'll be getting things to you. I'll be getting the Architectural Review Board stuff.

Village Attorney Stecich: And the landscape stuff.

Chairman Cameron: We're going to have a short executive session.

VII. OLD BUSINESS – None

VIII. NEW BUSINESS – None

XI. DISCUSSION

Chairman Cameron: Oh, I see one more thing to put in the minutes is the fact that I went and did a review. Juniper Restaurant I just want to put in the minutes.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Oh, you want to put it in the record. OK.

Chairman Cameron: Juniper, they were adding by putting a roof over the walk-in freezer. They had a potential view preservation issue. I went there, and so did the chair of the ZBA. We agreed with the Building Department with the fact there was no view [to speak of].

Interesting enough, one of things I realized while I was looking at it, as we were looking out the windows from the Juniper building was the fact that if you read the law carefully it only protects views from public spaces and other buildings. In other words, you're allowed to cover up your own windows if you want. That's the way the law is worded: "*preserving the views from public spaces and adjacent properties.*"

Boardmember O'Reilly: Not from your own property.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Not your own property.

Chairman Cameron: You can put out an extension on the back of the building.

Marianne got a proposal from Hahn, who we've used previously, to do the engineering work for us in reviewing this proposal. They gave us a range, because they weren't really sure what they were doing, based on the number of hours they were going to put in. We had used them before, and for the reasons I had sent you in an e-mail we were not totally happy with Langan, who we used prior.

What they said to us is that it would be a little higher than I thought it was going to be. They've been very good at billing in the past. That it would be \$10,000 to \$15,000, and it would be 65 to 100 hours, something like that?

Village Attorney Stecich: He hadn't seen the plans. What I sent was the approval.

Chairman Cameron: We're not paying for this, but it's always good with regard to developers to try to keep the costs down.

Village Attorney Stecich: But his hourly rate is low.

Boardmember Alligood: His hourly rates were very reasonable.

Village Attorney Stecich: I have to tell you, there are engineers that do a lot of this. Besides the regular engineering, we can hire them to do that – the flood study and all the stormwater study. That's what the basic issues are down there, and that's what they know inside out. They're probably not going to know lighting and they don't do landscaping, but they know flooding and engineering and they're very thorough and very responsive, and know who's hired them. I know Buddy's worked with them.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yeah, we deal with them all the time in Irvington and they're wonderful.

Village Attorney Stecich: They're terrific. And they've done some work for us. They're our set of eyes. Langan was retained by the owner, and then we asked Hahn to take a look at it. And they had a couple of changes.

Boardmember Sullivan: They really did a nice job.

Village Attorney Stecich: The guy's very young, but he works for his father. Doug himself is excellent.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yeah, he's sharp.

Chairman Cameron: If you all agree, I'd like a resolution approving we retain them.

Boardmember O'Reilly: He wouldn't have any hesitation. This is what we're asking him to do is specific items. He will include site plan compliance ... this is what we're asking him to do, right, in that sentence?

Village Attorney Stecich: Right. We'll review the site plan as steep slopes.

Boardmember Sullivan: We'll need a landscape architect.

Village Attorney Stecich: Separately. They don't do that. Does anybody know anybody? A landscape architect who's good at ... I guess somebody who also specializes in wetlands actually would be the kind of person. One who does wetlands.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Who do we use for our wetlands?

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't like her. She's very, very slow in getting going.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, we don't need that.

Village Attorney Stecich: I know another who's decent, but he usually does developers' work so I wouldn't hire him.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Do these people know somebody?

Village Attorney Stecich: It's Beth Evans, who's good but she just doesn't get back to you.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Would these people know landscape architects?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: I was just going to ask Marianne. Would Hahn know anybody, if we asked them?

Village Attorney Stecich: Let me think about it. Because we don't have their plan anyway. I can circulate it to the Board. The problem with the city people, they don't have as much, I would think, experience with riverfront stuff.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting Date – February 20, 2013

X. ADJOURNMENT