

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
NOVEMBER 19, 2015**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, November 19, 2015 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 Kathleen Sullivan, Boardmember Richard Bass, Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., and Planning Board Secretary Mary Ellen Ballantine

Chairman Cameron: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the November 19, 2015 meeting of the Planning Board. We'll start with a roll call please, Mary Ellen?

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of October 15, 2015

Chairman Cameron: Does anybody here have any comments on the minutes, any changes they wish to suggest on the minutes? Oh, we have two more members. We're doing the minutes.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I read them, and no comments.

Chairman Cameron: OK, great.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I was not here.

Chairman Cameron: OK, well, then you can't even vote. Do you have any comments on the minutes?

Boardmember Sullivan: No, none.

Deputy Village Clerk Ballantine: Kerry, do you have any ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: No, I have no comments on the minutes.

On MOTION of Boardmember Ambrozek, SECONDED by Boardmember Gould-Schmit with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of October 15, 2015 were approved as presented.

III. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. View Preservation Advisory and Site Plan Approval – Application of Arthur & Jessica Riolo for the construction of a second story rear addition and rear covered porch at their mixed-use dwelling at 36 Main Street. Said property is located in the CC Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.70-50-1 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairman Cameron: The first item on our agenda is the application of Arthur and Jessica Riolo for the construction of a second-story rear addition and rear covered porch of their mixed-use dwelling at 36 Main Street. Whoever's going to make the presentation, please come forward. Use the microphone, of course. You know that.

Arthur Riolo: Good evening, and thank you very much for having me. We're proposing a second-floor addition, as you mentioned; a small enhancement over an existing bay; a bay on top of the bay; and a rear portico that's covered to the rear of the building at 36 Main Street. We presently live at 32 Main Street. This is to basically rework the second floor kitchen and bathroom. We're stacking a bathroom on top of an existing bathroom, adding a bay, and increasing the square footage of the kitchen slightly.

Chairman Cameron: Do you have any presentation materials? They've just been taken by one of the members of the ...

Mr. Riolo: Right. Here.

Chairman Cameron: And you're looking for, I guess it's view preservation.

Mr. Riolo: Yes, it's strictly view preservation. It's in the central commercial district.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And site plan.

Chairman Cameron: Did you send out the notices on to view preservation?

Mr. Riolo: Yes.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Notices are in order.

Mr. Riolo: As you look, this is looking from basically south, north. It shows the existing bay window with a bay tower above it, stacked above it. The rear portico, presently there's a straight-run staircase without cover. We're proposing a portico that actually matches the rear portico we have at 32 Main Street and going over this existing ... by the way, this is about a 95 square foot addition of the second floor over an existing back hallway, which would be a bathroom.

Chairman Cameron: Does anybody on the Board have a question?

Boardmember Bass: I'd like to look at the plans.

Chairman Cameron: While he's taking a close look at the plans, does anybody in the audience wish to speak to this?

Yes, I would.

Chairman Cameron: Please come forward and state your name.

Michael Gismondo, owner - 38 Main Street: I own 38 Main Street since 1987, and I own 40 Main Street. Upon seeing this proposal, I've noticed that eventually if this is done hopefully it won't rob my tenants of a view. They've already lost views due to some construction that he's already done on the first floor.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Hold on one second, Mike.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The mic's not working. See if it's plugged in.

Mr. Gismondo: The work that was already done by Mr. Riolo there has affected my tenants on the first floor, meaning the fence that he erected. But the work he intends to do – he proposes to do on the second floor – will affect more tenants and rob them of their views. The yard would get absolutely no sun due to both constructions, and the second floor would be obstructed as far as the view's concerned, both the south and the west.

I bring to your attention that when the people that owned the house prior to Mr. Riolo applied for that same purpose – that same thing, to extend their homes – Mr. Riolo was the only one

that went to the meetings. He objected to that construction, and we'd like to bring that up only because we would like the same treatment and have that proposal rejected as well. We would be, actually, more affected by his construction because we are on the east side of it. If he extended north it would blind us. Whereas when the other person wanted to build, it would not have affected him at all because he was on the west side of that building.

So he got his way, and I'm hoping you can see it that way. The things he has built has made it very dangerous. I've had the intention to call – Mr. Mancuso is it?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Minozzi.

Mr. Gismondo: Mancosi – sorry, Minozzi – regarding the problems I had spoken to him about, meaning Mr. Riolo. He's got debris throughout the entire yard and driveway. My fire escape is obstructed by his fence, and all that stuff in the driveway is unsightly. Should there be a fire in my building my tenants wouldn't be able to leave, go down the fire escape, go up his driveway. There are other issues I'm hoping my tenants will be able to bring forth. I've had these tenants live in my building for over 10 years. They are basically alone, they don't have family besides themselves. And I think it would be very unfair to them to have to consider moving because they would not be able to enjoy where they live any longer.

I hope if I need to speak at a later time that I would be asked to come forward again. Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: Just a couple questions, though, while you're here.

Mr. Gismondo: Yes.

Chairman Cameron: The views you're talking about, are they views out over the Hudson River and Palisades?

Mr. Gismondo: Some of it indirectly, yes. They have photographs, actually. They've taken photographs from their apartments that would convey ... that would make you see that.

Chairman Cameron: Oh, the tenants are here.

Mr. Gismondo: Yes, they're right there. They would like to actually approach, if they can.

Chairman Cameron: Absolutely.

Mr. Gismondo: Thank you.

Caitlin Alexander – tenant, 38 Main Street: Hi. I only brought six copies.

Village Attorney Whitehead: No problem.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'll share.

Ms. Alexander: I live in the building directly east of 36. I've lived there for over 10 years now. So I'm a long-time resident of Hastings and have hoped to stay there for many more years, although I'm not sure if that will be possible. I unfortunately have to object to their proposed construction plans and ask that you please deny them. They've shown you some photos of the view, and I took a couple of photos that I gave to you of the view from my deck and from my hallway window which I think a little bit more accurately represent what my views are. Some of the photos they submitted make the buildings look a lot farther apart than they actually are.

A little bit about my apartment. It's a small apartment, it's about 400 square feet. The deck on the side of the apartment makes the apartment. It's really an essential space for me for an apartment that small. The deck is the whole reason I rented the apartments. I work from home so I make a lot of use of the deck. I'm pretty much out there every day when the weather is nice, I have the door open into the living room.

The first picture you have is a view from my deck door. What you can see is that when I look to the west I actually can see the Palisades and the river even, actually, through the trees. It's always hard to tell that stuff, some of the detail in a photo. But even through the trees I can see the river and the Palisades, looking west. And certainly in the winter I can see them very clearly.

Looking to the west, no other second-floor building extends out as far as they're proposing to add those bay windows on the second floor. It's going to block a significant portion of my view looking west from my deck door. When they add this extension coming out on the second floor, their building is going to be very, very close to my deck. It's going to interrupt a lot of the sunlight, it's going to prevent me from gardening. I already get a lot of shadow from their building. It's going to prevent me from gardening on the majority of my deck, it's going to make the space feel very, very claustrophobic.

The second photo you will see is from my hallway window. I even took the photo at an angle to be a little bit more generous. Basically, once they add that second floor extension to the side I'm not going to have any view from the hallway window. It's already the shadiest

part of my apartment, and it's going to be very, very dark. Basically, I'm going to look out the window and the only thing I'm going to see is their house instead of trees and sunlight.

I understand why, for convenience, they would love to make their second floor nicer. Their kitchen already is an eat-in kitchen so it's not like it's a tiny space to begin with. I hope the inconvenience and change to our circumstances in the building next door, you'll take that into serious consideration. It's going to make a huge impact on just my ability to enjoy my only outdoor space and, like I said, a very essential part of my living environment. So thank you. Does anybody have any questions?

Chairman Cameron: Sure. Does anyone here have any questions at this time? So your first objection is to the bay window they're planning to add to the back, I take it.

Ms. Alexander: Well, yes. As you can see, again, it extends farther than any other building looking west from my deck so it is going to interrupt ... you know, it's basically going to block my entire view of the Palisades and the river in that portion. I have to say I'm most concerned about the side addition because that's going to completely block my view from the hallway. It's going to block more of my view from the deck. It's going to block a lot of the air space and sunlight and everything. I know you guys are most concerned with the views of the river and the Palisades, and it is going to block those views entirely from the hallway of my apartment.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I'm sure you're going to find some of us peering on your back porch sometime because that's what we do. We didn't realize it was a real issue here. The law we would be considering is actually the view preservation law, which actually deals with only with views of the river and of the cliffs, not anything else. That's what we have to look at – look at it from your porch – and see how far the bay window sticks out. The second one, which is the portion of the addition, the bathroom addition, we have to look and see whether it does block views of the river and that if we want to apply that law to it. That's the question which is hard to tell sitting here.

Do you have any questions, comments, Kathy?

Boardmember Sullivan: Just as a thought, we're also looking at this for site plan as well. So other issues besides views could be taken into account. I just wanted to make that point.

Chairman Cameron: Sure.

Ms. Alexander: And I hope you would all put yourself in the position if you lived in a place for 10 years – and enjoyed it and it's, like I said, an essential part of your living space – you

would want to preserve that. So thank you. I know there's one other person who wants to speak so I'll sit.

Chairman Cameron: OK, somebody else?

[Megan] Victoria, 38 Main Street: I live in the first floor apartment in the rear of the building. I did bring two photos, but my main concern would be that the second floor addition would actually block all the remaining sunlight I receive from that end and would essentially close in the entire first floor apartment. You can see from this photo it's already a very dark room to begin with. This is the front room. It would cut off a considerable amount of the remaining sunlight.

My other question, actually, I wanted to get some clarification of the rear portico you were speaking of. Would it extend into the alley, or the driveway, between the two buildings? I wasn't sure from the plans if it would.

Mr. Riolo: Yes, it extends into ... the staircase coming down comes down into the driveway, or alleyway. But the driveway-alleyway is actually my property.

Ms. Victoria: Oh, yes, I'm aware of that.

Mr. Riolo: And also the fire escape that comes down off of your building goes onto my property, not onto Mr. Gismondo's property.

Ms. Victoria: Well, I'm sure fire safety would be more important than property lines in case of an accident.

Mr. Riolo: Yeah, but the idea is if it actually came down on his property, not on mine.

Ms. Victoria: I took a picture of the area in between the two buildings just to show you what it looks like currently. I was concerned that it would be, potentially, a fire hazard having a limited amount of space in between the alley when it's already cluttered with construction material. Up against my windows is actually like stacks of chairs and stacks of firewood. I am concerned that adding anything into that alley would potentially cause more of a fire hazard than already exists. Those were really my concerns. I'll just give these to you to look at.

Chairman Cameron: Well, that ladder thing is something more you should bring up with the Building Department, go down and talk to them about that.

Ms. Victoria: Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: Yes, sir? You're back again, I recognize you.

Mark Casella, Affordable Housing Committee: I just happen to know the properties pretty well. I just wanted to commend the Riolos on their historical renovation of these two buildings, which is really a lovely job. I mean, they're beautifully done and have enhanced the Village significantly. It would be nice to see some of the neighboring buildings follow the same suit. And I think he's contributing to the welfare of the community as opposed to hindering it.

Chairman Cameron: No, I agree. It's a beautiful building. I was wandering around that backyard today.

Mr. Casella: It's really great.

Chairman Cameron: I think if no one else has any more questions we have to do some more fact-gathering before we can really make ...

Boardmember Bass: Well, I actually have questions.

Chairman Cameron: Oh, please do.

Boardmember Bass: Buddy, are there violations on the site now?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Not that I'm aware of.

Boardmember Bass: Is there an easement for fire egress from ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Not that I'm aware of.

Boardmember Bass: Is that because you don't know or we don't have deeds? Because it's very unusual that my fire escape goes onto your property unless there is some type of easement.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I just don't know. There is nothing on any surveys that says anything. We don't have deeds in the Building Department so that would have to be researched.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's not on the survey. There was a survey submitted and there's no reference on the survey to an easement.

Boardmember Bass: When you both bought your properties, were there title searches done?

Mr. Riolo: Yes, on mine.

Mr. Gismondo: Sorry, I can't hear you.

Boardmember Bass: When you bought the property was there a title search done?

Mr. Gismondo: Yes.

Boardmember Bass: Can both of you share your title searches with Buddy so we could review that?

Mr. Gismondo: I'm not sure that the fire escape and/or ladder falls on his property. But when the people get off the ladder they would go onto his property. But that's the way it was constructed. The building's been there 140 years.

Boardmember Bass: Right. And normally when that happens there is usually an easement.

Mr. Gismondo: Correct ...

[cross-talk]

Boardmember Bass: I would like to know whether there is or there is not an easement. The only way we're going to find out is by the title report. So if you would indulge me, I would love to have that.

Mr. Gismondo: Sure, I would. Not a problem.

Boardmember Bass: Thank you. The plans don't have a lot of details in terms of ... it's a site plan. Normally, when you have a site plan you have the lot size, the lot coverage, existing condition, proposed condition. We don't have that.

Mr. Riolo: Actually, on the three sets that I was to submit there is that.

Boardmember Bass: And I apologize. I rushed out of my office ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: He has existing and proposed for each floor.

Boardmember Bass: Could I see that? I left my file at the office.

[cross-talk]

... but it doesn't give me ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: Can I just ask if the site plan is from historical records, or is this done by an architect?

Mr. Riolo: Yes, it was done by my brother-in-law, Thomas Nugent, who resides ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: But did you look at the property line and the fire escape?

Boardmember Bass: Actually, can the architect come up so we can ask?

Tom Nugent, project architect: What are your questions?

Boardmember O'Reilly: My question was, did you do a survey to look at the property line and that fire escape which is being referred to? I'm looking at this sketch here. It looks like it is site plan proposed conditions, and it's got a property line but I don't see any fire escape impinging on that property line.

Mr. Nugent: I did not survey the neighboring building. I took measurements of our building and then our lot and I used a legal survey to verify the location of the property line.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You do have a survey.

Boardmember O'Reilly: So by a legal survey you mean a preexisting survey?

Mr. Nugent: A preexisting legal survey. I didn't survey, but I used the 7-foot plus-minus dimension as my data for establishing where the property line would be put on my drawing.

Village Attorney Whitehead: There is a survey in your package, and it doesn't not show any encroachment. I think the adjacent neighbor indicated he doesn't think it does encroach.

Boardmember Bass: You're going to have to indulge me. I left my file, all my code in my office, so I'm going to ask you a lot of stupid questions. So please indulge me.

Mr. Nugent: Ask.

Boardmember Bass: The existing lot coverage. What is the existing lot coverage – what's proposed – and what does the code permit?

Mr. Nugent: There's no change in ... excuse me. Do you have that sheet?

Boardmember Bass: Because it looks like there's an increase in the lot coverage.

Mr. Riolo: Actually, there is no footprint change.

Building Inspector Minozzi: He's complying with all setbacks and encroachments. We checked all of those [cross-talk].

Boardmember Bass: OK, thank you.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I don't have those numbers in front of me – I gave you my package – but everything checks out.

Boardmember Bass: OK, that's what I was asking.

Mr. Nugent: We did submit a table with those calculations, with those numbers.

Chairman Cameron: So anybody else have any questions?

Mr. Nugent: I'd just like to make a comment. The plans and zoning table that we provided has dimensions, so we've explicitly presented any increases or changes, we've noted the setbacks, and we've also dimensioned the additions and alterations.

Boardmember Bass: And the reason for the bay window in the expansion?

Mr. Riolo: It was to put ... there's an existing bay window on the first floor, and it was to stack a bay above it to just basically increase the air circulation over the interior room, which is the kitchen and (mic not turned on).

Boardmember Bass: And that couldn't be satisfied by just putting another window on that southern wall?

Mr. Riolo: It certainly could be satisfied by that, yes.

Chairman Cameron: But you already have a window there just flat against the ...

Mr. Riolo: It is a small window. That's from the existing ledge.

Building Inspector Minozzi: There is no coverage in this particular neighborhood because there's zero lot lines.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, the downtown is ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Unless, of course, it abuts a residential neighborhood, which this doesn't.

Boardmember Bass: And the building code doesn't require it. What's the building code distance between window to window?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Excuse me?

Boardmember Bass: The building code requirement between window to window?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Property line to window?

Boardmember Bass: Yeah.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Three feet.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And that's clear.

Boardmember O'Reilly: And to remind me, the bay window is similar to this one below to go above?

Mr. Riolo: Yes.

Boardmember O'Reilly: It duplicates that on this level.

Mr. Riolo: That's correct.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I have a clarification question. I understand the issue with the lighting being blocked with the second floor extension into the alleyway. But I do think,

with Richard's question, if they're meeting the 3-foot clearance we don't necessarily have any jurisdiction over that, correct?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Site plan you can consider light and air.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: You can? OK.

Boardmember Bass: We can do anything we want.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, no, you can't do anything you want. It has to be within what your code allows you to look at as part of a site plan approval. It's actually not that broad.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: OK, just the light and air [cross-talk] come across the line.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I'm just going to check with....

Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes, we actually spent some time on this application way before it came here, and we addressed all the code compliance issues as far as exterior goes. Of course, we haven't gone into the interior yet, but as far as setbacks and coverage and fire issues all that's been addressed before he even made a submission.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Chairman Cameron: So one issue we have is to go and take a closer look at the view looking at the Palisades and the river. And I don't think we'll need to have anything flagged. I think we can just go up and take a look at it, get access to the back porch.

Boardmember Bass: Would you mind if we come visit?

Ms. Victoria: You're welcome to.

Chairman Cameron: What's a good time?

Boardmember Bass: We'll bring cookies.

Building Inspector Minozzi: The tenants can e-mail me and I'll forward it to the Board and we'll set it up.

Boardmember Bass: OK, great.

Chairman Cameron: Does anyone have any questions about something which doesn't involve ... I guess there really is no issue other than the air. The issue's already been brought up, we really don't have any other ... just trying to clear things out of the way so we keep moving forward.

So we're going to put this off until next month, and thank you for coming and thank you addressing your issues. I guess that's why we're here.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Mr. Chairman, you've done it in the past with these view preservation cases. Maybe the applicant could put up some boards to represent maybe where the addition's going or where the window is. So when you do go for your site visit you can actually see. Like we did on Edmarth Place we had to do that mock roof and stuff like that, maybe that would be an advisable idea.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Maybe even just a pole.

Boardmember Bass: A flag.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Nothing fancy.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Here, I don't think you need a lot. But just if you could see.

Boardmember Bass: Yeah, right. That's a good suggestion.

Village Attorney Whitehead: One thing that'll help you is that the addition on the side doesn't extend back quite as far as the existing.

Chairman Cameron: But you're going to see it on the angle.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Maybe they could put a pole up on the corner and maybe do a little slight mockup on the bay window or something like that.

Chairman Cameron: That's probably a good idea to put a couple poles up on the corners of the lower bay so they extend up and you can see them. Then a pole at the corner where your addition – your bathroom addition – is going to protrude the most out so we can see that, too. It's just is very simple to put them up, you don't do anything fancy, and we'll come and take a look.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just so the Board could be able to see if there's any ...

Chairman Cameron: And let's let Buddy know when you've done it so we can get an e-mail from Buddy and know we can come over and take a look at it.

2. **Accessory Apartment Approval – Application of Anthony Tarricone for approval to create a new Accessory Apartment at his single family dwelling at 11 Summit Street. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.140-146-23 on the Village Tax Maps. Waivers required: (1) Square footage: Existing N/A; Proposed 33.5%; Maximum allowed 25% – 8.5%; (2) Off-street parking: Existing three (3) spaces, four (4) with one tandem; Required four (4) without tandem.**

Chairman Cameron: This is an accessory apartment approval, an application by Anthony Tarricone for approval to create a new accessory apartment in a single-family dwelling at 11 Summit Street, located in the R-10 zoning district. There are two waivers evidently required, one for the square footage of the accessory apartment because it will be bigger than 25 percent, and the other off-street parking. They have existing three parking spots, a fourth one by parking cars in tandem, and the required amount is four without tandem.

Anthony Tarricone, applicant: Good evening, and thank you for hearing me. I'm here to present an auxiliary apartment for my house that just lays out perfectly. Actually, I have four children, three of which are in college now for the next four years and then a fourth one to start. It's a bit of a financial burden on me, and that's why I'd like to stay in Hastings and be able to do that, quite frankly.

The house lays out ... you walk into the house actually on the second floor, and there are three bedrooms on the second floor. The downstairs is basically a mirror of it. Since all the children are gone, it's just empty. There's two separate entrances. It's already preexisting; there's already a washer and dryer down there, there's already a sink down there, it's existing. So the only thing you'd actually be adding is a stove and a refrigerator. It's just all laid out, and that's why.

In terms of parking, there's a really good opportunity to do tandem parking right next to the house. And it's actually much lower than the street. I measured it. It's 4 feet lower than the street so you wouldn't even see the cars. Like I say, it just lays out perfectly.

Chairman Cameron: So the idea would be, the tandem parking would be for your tenant in the accessory unit?

Mr. Tarricone: Yes.

Chairman Cameron: I went and looked. There's a white car sitting there right now.

Mr. Tarricone: Yes, that's our car. It's a Volt, it's plugged in.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Because of the way our code's written, the tandem parking doesn't count as two. So we have to have a waiver for one of the spaces.

Chairman Cameron: Do you have any slides to show us? We did get the charts you sent to us. When you turned the TV on I thought you were about to come up with a slide show.

Mr. Tarricone: I don't know what magic we have. I have a picture, if I can approach. Sorry I didn't bring more.

Chairman Cameron: I was there today, so I'll pass it this way. While we're looking at the pictures, does anybody have any questions about this they'd like to ask?

Boardmember Bass: Three in college, huh?

Mr. Tarricone: And then the fourth following. So three in college for four years at the same time.

Chairman Cameron: If it'd only been identical twins you could have them all go to the same classes.

Mr. Tarricone: The numbers are unbelievable. It's shocking.

Chairman Cameron: Anybody else?

Christina Griffin, project architect: I prepared the plans for the accessory apartment using plans given to me by Anthony Tarricone. I wanted to show the site plan, which shows existing tandem parking they already have. This is the parking we'd like to use for the accessory apartment. There's a walk from this driveway to an entrance to the accessory apartment. The front entrance to the house is over here. So you come in – there's a two-car garage and a little extra parking here – and there's two spaces here that could be easily used for that apartment.

Chairman Cameron: There's also steps coming down from the street connected to the back.

Mr. Tarricone: Yes. It just lays out without any changes really.

Ms. Griffin: This is just the zoning chart. See if I can show you the floor plan. This is the floor plan of the accessory apartment. We'd like to convert the two bedrooms, full bath and study into the accessory apartment. This is already existing. And this also has a living room, a space here that could be a dining room. This is an existing laundry that can be easily converted into a kitchen. It has a separate entrance.

Mr. Tarricone: It's two separate entrances.

Ms. Griffin: It has two separate entrances? The existing house is 4,800 square feet, roughly. If we break it into a three-bedroom house and two-bedroom accessory apartment the house will be 3,200 square feet and the accessory apartment will be about 1,600 square feet. This is the plan of the main house ... it's funny, it's not on my screen.

Chairman Cameron: It wants to run, it doesn't want to close.

Ms. Griffin: Raf is not here to help us out. It's not on my computer.

Village Attorney Whitehead: There it goes.

Building Inspector Minozzi: It got scared.

Ms. Griffin: That's the floor plan of the main house. The main house has a nice-sized kitchen, dining room, living room, three bedrooms and two baths so it's still a comfortable home. It's really ideal for an accessory apartment. We are asking for a waiver, though, to the percentage of the house that will be the accessory apartment. The apartment that's on the lower level is 1,600 square feet.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Well, I based my calculations on 1,750, and it's going to be an 8.5 percent overage in square footage. We've done more. Then the parking space. They'll be the two waivers that would be requested and require if this was to be approved.

Boardmember Sullivan: When was the house built?

Mr. Tarricone: I think in the mid-fifties.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I have a question regarding emergency egress. I can only see one entrance into the accessory apartment on this plan. Does there need to be an emergency egress from each of the proposed bedrooms?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes, but we'll handle that when it comes down to the building permit. They haven't received a building permit for the accessory apartment yet. This is just for the actual approval of it, then the next step would be to apply for a building permit for the accessory apartment. That would be the interior layout and egress, and we make sure all those things are in place.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Oh, thank you.

Ms. Griffin: But every bedroom has an egress window. There's two ways out of each bedroom – egress window and the door – and there are already smoke detectors in place.

Boardmember Bass: Snow removal and walking in through the path into the back?

Mr. Tarricone: I'm praying for no snow.

Boardmember Bass: You have to wait in line. But I hear we're going to have a tough winter.

Mr. Tarricone: It's a paved path so we can shovel it. It's not grass.

Boardmember Bass: OK. It's cement or stone?

Mr. Tarricone: It's cement.

Boardmember Bass: So you can bring a snow plow or a kid.

Village Attorney Whitehead: A kid.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Around the furnace, you indicate that it's going to use fire-rated self-closing doors. What is the material that is currently around the furnace?

Mr. Tarricone: It's already there. There are steel doors. It's already been through the Zoning and Building Department and everything else. It's already been done. We upgraded the house a couple years back, and that's already been there done that.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Plus we will also check it. That'll be one of the things that will be pulled out on the plans. We have to make sure about the fire-rated enclosure.

Mr. Tarricone: It's block and steel doors.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'm personally really happy to see new accessory apartments come through. And the waivers, Buddy knows the numbers much better, but we frequently have waivers for square footage and parking. We don't use tandem parking so having an official third space rather than four is very common. I'm very happy and excited to see this happening as a way people can take advantage of their homes in a different way.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I second Kathy. I think it's great to see an apartment, especially of this size, to add to the housing mix in the Village.

Chairman Cameron: We have no more questions. Are there any questions from the audience? OK. Can I have a motion? I'll read the motion and then somebody can do that.

On MOTION of Boardmember Gould-Schmit, SECONDED by Boardmember Ambrozek with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved that the Planning Board approve the application of Anthony Tarricone to create a new accessory apartment in a single-family dwelling at 11 Summit Street, known as SBL: 4.140-146-23 on the Village Tax Maps, as shown on the plans of Christina Griffin Architect PC, submitted to the Planning Board and dated September 28, 2015; and approves waivers for off-street parking, existing three with four in tandem, and for square footage: 33.5 percent, 25 percent allowed.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you very much.

Mr. Tarricone: Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: We all want to rent it, by the way.

Boardmember Sullivan: I just saw that barbecue in back. I thought that was cool.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - None

V. OLD PUBLIC HEARING

View Preservation and Site Plan Approval – Application of RTB Washington LLC for the construction of 16 townhouses in three separate clusters, a café and pedestrian mews over a subgrade parking garage at 9-17 Washington Avenue. Said property is located in the MR-C Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.70-48-37 & 38 on the Village Tax Maps

Ned Baldwin, Baldwin & Franklin Architects: Our client, Mr. Cheng, is unable to be here this evening. I'd like to run through what has transpired on the project since September when we were last before you.

We prepared, for your October meeting, making drawing revisions which we submitted at that time – and which you have on drawings one through six and a new drawing, 15 – which covered the open space illustration that was requested. The changes on those drawings were restricted basically to removal of the spiral stairs on to balconies on the west side: the substitution of roof access by an internal stair and a sloping roof hatch – not a penthouse, but a roof hatch – which I believe is only 3-1/2 feet or so above the roof. Those were essentially the changes on those drawings.

The variances required for the project remain the same: namely, coverage 87.8 percent in lieu of 80; 25 parking spaces in lieu of 29, and actually 24 parking spaces in lieu of 29 if Mr. Minozzi decrees that space 25 is too far from the elevator, which has not been resolved as yet. The third one is side yards zero feet in lieu of 27 feet, 27 and 25 feet east. In addition to those three variances, we're asking the Board to recommend to the Board of Trustees that Village lands be used by easement to construct and maintain a walkway to the commuter parking lot at the rear of the project.

At the time of our submission for the October meeting where were five outstanding code issues which had been raised by members of the Board and Mr. Minozzi. At the time, we submitted our letter for the October meeting that those had not been resolved. They have been resolved since then, and we have included in the submission for the November meeting a summary of what the agreements have been in the form of a memorandum to Mr. Minozzi. Essentially, the most important is that it was determined that the north means of egress need not be handicapped-accessible and that the Village lands to the north constituted a public way by themselves. Therefore, there would be no need to secure any code variances of any sort for use of a 4-foot wide path as an exit.

Another issue was the exit discharge points be not more than 10 feet from the property line. That was determined not to apply to this project. I'm sorry there's so many different documents. The balconies on the west side of the project were deemed not to be balconies

but parts of the building, and therefore that they could extend to within inches of the property line so long as their construction met the code in terms of fire rating. The amount of glazing, you may recall that we had shown 8-foot wide sliding doors on every unit on that west elevation, protected by a rolling steel fire shutter. Mr. Minozzi, along with the state code official, has determined that the fire shutters are not required. And that in lieu of a sliding door with unprotected glass we can use a swinging door which will stay within the 25 percent unprotected opening limit and supplement it with fire-rated glass – one-hour rated glass – to make up the 57 square feet we're looking for.

Buddy, was there another one? There was, I think, one other spot.

Building Inspector Minozzi: The questions we had to handle with the state were the rear egress needing to ADA-accessible. It does not. Because of the width of the front egress at 20 feet wide, it equals over two ADA-accessible egresses. The code doesn't say the egresses have to be remote; they can be next to each other. So it meets the two ADA egresses – at least two, could even be three – and has a rear egress that's not accessible but is still an egress from the mews.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's an extra.

Building Inspector Minozzi: It's an extra, right.

Boardmember Sullivan: Actually, the ADA is the extra in front.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Excuse me?

Boardmember Sullivan: The one in back's essential. The ADAs in the front are extras.

Village Attorney Whitehead: No, the one in the back doesn't have to be ADA.

Building Inspector Minozzi: The two in the front have to be ADA.

Village Attorney Whitehead: There have to be two ADA-compliant means of egress.

Building Inspector Minozzi: The other issues were the rear stairs accessing the public-way not being 10 feet from the property line. As it turns out, that is only a rule for when you are against another dwelling property. That is public space back there, and it's just like the front being a zero lot line. So that was dismissed.

The spiral stairs from to roof, we spoke about and you made the change. Because the spiral

stairs from the roof would have been an egress that would have been an issue and would have to maintain 10 feet from the property line, which you couldn't meet. Ned changed that, so the spiral stair from the first to the second floor on the west buildings are not the primary egress and don't have to meet any particular code. Also, Ned mentioned the projections of the terraces into the required fire setback. Being the way the building is constructed, the walls continue out, the floor continues out, the ceiling continues out; it's an outdoor space within the footprint of the unit so it is not considered a terrace. That was also removed from our issues.

Ned already explained the 25 percent openings that were adjusted. The reduction in the maneuvering area in the basement and garage was approved by Hahn – recommended by Hahn that we approve and send to the Zoning Board – the reduction of 1 foot, from 25 to 24. As you all saw in the memo from Hahn today I sent you late in the day – or midday or so – it was talking about the driveway slope, the ingress-egress out of the driveway, and some SWPPP stuff. That stuff is still up in the air.

Mr. Baldwin: Postponement of the appearance in October was due to the requirement that a full stormwater pollution prevention plan be prepared. We carried out a soils investigation on-site, drilled three wells, did infiltration tests, then commissioned JMC Consultants/Engineers in Armonk to do the SWPPP. That was presented to Hahn Engineering on the 5th of the month. We don't have a response from them, although I have discussed it with them and they seem to think the soils are extremely good, everything looks very promising: the concept of accommodating the stormwater under the building is a workable concept. Unfortunately, we don't have their detailed analysis of the SWPPP.

I can run through, if you are interested, the arguments we presented, or just repeat the arguments we presented for the three variances. They were in a written document. I'm happy to go through them again if you are interested. We have, obviously, not revised the drawings further after the October thing because we only got the approval, for instance, on removal of the shutters. We only got approval of that a few days ago.

Chairman Cameron: No, I don't think it's necessary to go through the arguments.

Mr. Baldwin: OK.

Building Inspector Minozzi: For the record, there are four variances being requested here and BOT approval. The four variances are the setbacks, the coverage, the parking space amounts, and the maneuver aisle in the garage.

Mr. Baldwin: I forgot that one.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I just need to go a little bit further with this. After re-looking at the basement-cellar issue, the first three times I did it I was taking the buildings individually, which I realized was a mistake. Because the parking structure is being counted as coverage, even though it's subterranean, we have to count the entire structure, not just the two clusters of buildings for basements, the basement-cellar debate. I painstakingly did the calculations again for the fourth time tonight, and after two hours I came up with 47.625 percent above ground which makes them still in compliance with the stories. So they don't have to reduce height for code. View preservation's another issue, that's with you guys. But for code-wise, they are approximately 2-2/3 percent in compliance.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The lower level is a cellar, not a basement.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Is a cellar, not a basement.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So it doesn't count as a story.

Mr. Baldwin: You trying to give me a heart attack, Buddy?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Almost.

Mr. Baldwin: There was discussion at the last meeting about verification of our flags. I don't know what's happened on that. You know, we've cooperated in every way we could with the fellow that was going to do it, but I have not seen any results.

Building Inspector Minozzi: We received a survey last month about the flag height certification. The Board was e-mailed that survey, which I have in my hand, dated October 12, 2015. Those were the verifications of the flag heights. We received a new survey with the overlay on it. That is the new survey that was just received two or three ago days showing the heights of the buildings on the Washington Avenue side.

Chairman Cameron: At our meeting in September – and I know you weren't the one who spoke, your client spoke – when we asked for a flag on the Washington Avenue buildings, he told us the new buildings actually were not as high as the existing buildings so he couldn't put up a flag.

Mr. Baldwin: What?

Chairman Cameron: That's what he said. Anyway, that's why I brought up the surveyor. I know now you see it and you probably knew it, but he didn't seem to. So we did not get any

flags on the Washington Avenue side, and that's the part that's been concerning us. You can see here the height of those buildings as compared to the height of the existing buildings on the street. They are the heights you actually wrote down, as well. They're not any different from the ones you sent to us, it's just that they've been drawn by him onto the plans.

Mr. Baldwin: I don't believe there's any difference between ... I mean, what we've shown here is exactly what's been shown there.

Chairman Cameron: Right. So what we need, Ned, is for you to have someone go up on the roof of those two buildings and put up a 10-foot post and two 20-foot posts so we can stand there and look at the flags. Because as you and I know from looking at photographs, it does further obscure the view than the current buildings do, your proposal. We need to have the flags. On the Washington Avenue side we can't do view preservation without actually seeing how high the buildings really are.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, of course we show that in our model. I was unaware that there was any view preservation issue with those things.

Chairman Cameron: I brought it up right in front of you. Go and read the minutes, you'll see I brought it up as a concern. You admitted it obscured more of the river than the other ones did, and I'd like to see the flags. It's relatively easy to do; it's a 10-foot pole and a 20-foot pole.

Mr. Baldwin: It's actually, I think, 9 feet higher than the existing building on the right.

Chairman Cameron: OK, maybe it's under 10 but whatever it is.

Building Inspector Minozzi: How many poles do you want them to put up?

Chairman Cameron: I think we probably should put one up for each building, you know, but maybe only one on the big building because it's going to be the taller of the two you're going to put up. Then you put one on either of the two lower buildings.

Building Inspector Minozzi: So three poles.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah.

Boardmember Sullivan: So, Jamie, you want to indicate the height of the westernmost building? Is that what you're talking about?

Chairman Cameron: What you're seeing is the outline of the units as they go down Washington, and if you put a pole on top of each one of those buildings ...

Mr. Baldwin: Here?

Chairman Cameron: We'll discuss where it's going to go in a minute. I wonder which way you see it better. No, you should put the pole on the western edge of the building. That's right, because that's what's going to block people's view.

Mr. Baldwin: OK, western edge of each building?

Boardmember O'Reilly: Each building, yeah.

Chairman Cameron: Yes, that would be good.

Building Inspector Minozzi: The western edge of each building, so four poles.

Chairman Cameron: Four poles. It should be fairly easy to put up because it's a nice flat room and it's only a 20-foot pole, the longest one.

Mr. Baldwin: Because that roof ... you can't drive a stake into the ground and guide it.

Chairman Cameron: Why can't you? You're not going to reoccupy those buildings; you just nail it right into the asphalt roof.

Mr. Baldwin: These buildings are occupied now by ... there are people living ...

Chairman Cameron: Oh, the lower two are? OK.

Mr. Baldwin: Yeah. They're already upset about our poles. If we try to put something on the roof here it's going to be ... the only thing we can do is maybe do it out on the street, on this street façade, and bolt it to the building or something.

Chairman Cameron: OK, and bolt the other one to the other building.

Mr. Baldwin: But this is complete news to me that these were even an issue. They're all in compliance for height.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Yeah, but we can't see it.

Chairman Cameron: But not for view preservation. We've talked to you about it, I asked for the poles. Your client said, "Oh, no, no. The buildings aren't as tall as the buildings. I can't put up a flag for that reason." And you sat right next to him.

Mr. Baldwin: I'm sorry. I didn't ...

Chairman Cameron: You were concentrating on something else. We can't see the height of those buildings in relationship, standing behind. And the other people, we are not doing our duty.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, is there anything else that's standing between us and hope on this project?

Boardmember Sullivan: A couple of things, in my perspective. I have a long list.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I have one which is a nit and really not standing between us and voting on this project. That is, I keep wandering over onto Washington somewhere between 7:30 and 8:30 in the morning and see all those wonderful cars tear-ass'ing down the hill. So a minor condition, I would think, is that you put a motion-actuated light over the door of your garage where it comes out so as I'm coming down the hill and racing for the last train this light starts flashing or something on your door when someone starts coming up. I'm just predicting we're going to have ...

Mr. Baldwin: Well, I was proposing a flashing light on the edge of the wall ...

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, that might be it.

Mr. Baldwin: ... which would be quite visible to anybody coming down the street. It's right there.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Hahn had specifically talked to me about the driveway and the entrance issue, and the light and how the light's going to work. He suggested we get more details, some clarification, on the slope of the driveway – not the pitch of the driveway, but the slope of the driveway. He made some recommendations – he's going to be making some recommendations – about the entrance and exit, as we talked about, Kathy. He also recommended we get a traffic professional to study the plan and, of course, the SWPPP review. Those are the things coming from Hahn so those are still hurdles the applicant is going to have to go over.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think the Board needs to decide if they want to retain an

additional consultant to look at the driveway issues, which is what Hahn said. They're not experts, not traffic experts or traffic engineers, so that's why he just raised in his memo whether the Board might want to retain another professional to look at that and advise you on that.

Boardmember Sullivan: A little background. I had communicated with Buddy and we talked over what standards were being used to just make sure that driveway was safe. It's unusual because it's actually not 90 degrees to the center line of the street, but at an acute angle – actually angling down the hills. The people coming down the hill and taking turns, it could be problematic. I think for the Village it would be prudent to have some advice just to make sure you could get a safe entrance and exit for people who are walking down the sidewalk as well as trying to drive up and down the hill.

Chairman Cameron: Well, it does have a heated sidewalk for the winter issues.

Boardmember Sullivan: I understand, but I'm more concerned because I've driven that road a lot at peak rush hour times and it's a very dangerous situation.

Boardmember Bass: I also understand the Village is looking at traffic calming installations, particularly on Washington.

Boardmember Sullivan: Be nice to know.

Boardmember Bass: It would be nice to know.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yeah, it would be useful to find out ...

Boardmember Bass: Where they're proposing on Washington to avoid the people speeding down Washington. I know there's going to be a couple of test cases, I think on Villard and one on Washington. We should know where they are and how it would impact this site plan.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think Washington was up by the Aqueduct, where the Aqueduct crosses.

Boardmember O'Reilly: It's awhile since I had to go for a peak-hour train in the morning, but I always used to try and time my drive down Washington to be when the DPW was not collecting garbage at that point. It slowed you up, and given the size of this building and the garbage they'll be adding that also I think is a consideration on traffic flow.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I agree. To me, the view of the driveway and getting in and

out on Washington are my biggest concerns about the project. And I don't know that we have the expertise to sort of make those determinations on our own.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I'm more worried about the other idiots going up and down the hill. I'm worried about the number of cars coming out of his garage because I think it'll be fairly low.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: The slope is my concern. The sight lines are not.

Boardmember Bass: So, Kathy, what are your concerns?

Chairman Cameron: Yes, go ahead, Kathy.

Boardmember Sullivan: I want to thank Buddy very much for taking on the building code issues and working them, and kind of getting us to a point where we feel this building isn't going to move someplace because we have some issue come down the pike. So thank you for all your time in that, it's very appreciated.

Now that we sort of are settled on the proposal, I think there are a couple of things I'd like to request is that we understand what easements are going to be used on this property. What I mean by that is, the sewer easement where you're proposing to build on top of it I think we should have some acknowledgment from whoever's easement that is that they accept what's being proposed.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's not being built on top of the sewer.

Boardmember Sullivan: There's a garbage building that's being built on top of the easement.

Mr. Baldwin: The garbage building is seen as a temporary structure that can be removed. If any work had to be done on that sewer it can be removed.

Boardmember Sullivan: My point is, I understand that's your position. I'd like it to be acknowledged and verified by whoever owns that easement.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That would probably have to be a county Department of Environmental ...

Mr. Baldwin: We've already been to the county Department of Environmental Services down in New Rochelle and they had no problem with the project.

Boardmember Sullivan: What I'm looking for is a letter from them stating that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Can you get something in writing from them saying they have no objection with that building being on their easement.

Mr. Baldwin: All right.

Boardmember Sullivan: I mean, it's kind of a due diligence thing from my perspective. I'm not arguing with it being there. I'm just saying it seemed to be an issue and someone might be concerned about it.

I guess there was another conversation where there was some talk about using the sliver of land between the big retaining wall and the eastern group of houses. I don't know what your plans are.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, we don't intend to use it without the permission of the ... it has to be worked out with each individual owner. The surveyor says it would be a nightmare to sort out ownership, to determine ownership, by either party. He's basically saying "You're on your own, negotiate with that thing. If he says you can't use it, then it's up to you to decide whether or not you want to fight it out in court." Essentially, I don't know what the solution would be. Our project does not depend on it. We can hang a stainless steel grid on there and have growies come up and cover the wall, which is our intention. Whether that grid is a foot away from the wall or 2 feet away from the wall really doesn't matter.

Boardmember Sullivan: So somehow the final plan will indicate what you're planning.

Mr. Baldwin: No, I think that is unrealistic because we won't know until we actually get to the point of building it and having a discussion with each owner. You know, it seems unnecessary somehow to have to resolve that issue at this stage in the project. It's not vital to the project.

Boardmember Sullivan: My point is that your final plan to us for approval should show something on the property line indicating ...

Mr. Baldwin: We will show our mesh-supporting vines on our property line.

Boardmember Sullivan: OK. So like you're saying, that's not something you're planning on doing at this point.

Mr. Baldwin: I'm sorry?

Village Attorney Whitehead: No, it should be shown on the existing property line of what you know you will ...

Mr. Baldwin: Right, OK.

Boardmember Sullivan: That's good.

At some point, it'd be good to see the lighting that's being proposed on the plan. I know there's a verbal description of it, but it would be useful to understand where it's going to be located and also see some cut sheets on it to understand what kind of lighting it's going to be. And also getting more detail on the fences. It looks like there's fences between the units on the east side?

Mr. Baldwin: Yes.

Boardmember Sullivan: So getting some idea of how tall they are, what they look like.

And there's also a retaining wall that you're building on the north side.

Mr. Baldwin: Mm-hmm.

Boardmember Sullivan: That's to support the ...

Mr. Baldwin: We have terraces that are elevated above the floor of that house. Because there's a slope there, we don't want to cut into that slope because there's a retaining wall which is not very deeply founded behind it. We want to protect that slope so we raise the terraces two or three steps above the floor of each house so the terrace is sort of halfway up the slope.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right. But there's also a large retaining wall on the north side that goes from the parking garage to the northeast corner. Because you have an elevation of 102, and the ground elevation's like 92 at that point.

Mr. Baldwin: You're talking on unit E-1?

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes.

Mr. Baldwin: [Off-mic]

Boardmember Sullivan: Right here.

Mr. Baldwin: There's a small [off-mic].

Boardmember Sullivan: So it should be shown on the plans.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The lighting should be on the plans. Your site plan should include your proposed lighting. That's something the Board needs to look at.

Mr. Baldwin: All right.

Boardmember Sullivan: And at some point you'll have utilities.

I just wanted to mention that we did get the SWPPP electronically, but the PDF that I got did not have drawings. It did not have the layout drawings at all, nor did it have any information on the CULTEC infiltration system. So unfortunately it was incomplete.

Mr. Baldwin: The drawings that went with the SWPPP were not in the flash drive? Is that what you're saying?

Boardmember Sullivan: That is what I'm saying. There were two drawings just showing the drainage areas.

Mr. Baldwin: Yeah, right.

Boardmember Sullivan: Not the four drawings that were produced to show [cross-talk] ...

Mr. Baldwin: We sent ...

Boardmember Sullivan: I'm not sure if your printed SWPPPs ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: I didn't realize they weren't there, else I would have said something to Ned. I'm sorry about that.

Boardmember Sullivan: I may not have mentioned it. Just a note: as you look at the SWPPP, there were references to other projects in the SWPPP that were inaccurate. There's actually a description of another Hastings project, and then there was also talk about the green rooms going on top of a showroom facility. If someone looks at that ...

Mr. Baldwin: You mean there's a reference to some other project?

Boardmember Sullivan: Correct.

Building Inspector Minozzi: [Unintelligible].

Village Attorney Whitehead: [Unintelligible].

Mr. Baldwin: I'm sorry, that's very boring reading. I'm amazed you read it.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, actually the front part's easy to read. It's the pages of numbers that I stay away from.

Building Inspector Minozzi: They're talking about a green roof over a showroom.

Mr. Baldwin: Over a showroom? We had very little time to produce that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And I was going to say, it seems like they were doing it in a hurry and cut and pasted.

Mr. Baldwin: I was wielding a whip because I needed it by the 5th.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'm sorry, I have a list. At some point, we'll have to talk about the reservation of fees for parkland at some point. One of the benefits of this project, if it goes forward, is the ability to have affordable housing that's within the units. I would be interested personally – and maybe other Boardmembers feel the same – for the Affordable Housing Committee to let us know kind of what the breakdown is currently of affordable units in Hastings, kind of what unit sizes are – one-bedrooms, two-bedrooms – and if that can help guide us towards understanding the sizes that would be helpful to have here.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I think pound for pound Hastings has more affordable housing per square mile than any other town in Westchester County.

Boardmember Sullivan: What I mean, though, is ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: You want a breakdown, right? of how many one-bedrooms, how many 2 bedroom's.

Boardmember Sullivan: Like how many one-bedroom's, two-bedroom's kind of thing. And then get a sense from you guys – and I'm looking at Sue – is there a better unit size that

would be more useful over another size. This would be separate from negotiating with the developer. This would be just sort of good information, I think, for us to have.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, Mr. Cheng got together with Mr. Riolo and Sue Smith, and they came up with a suggestion – 1 one-bedroom, 1 two-bedroom – and those were submitted to you for confirmation.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right, I understand. I'm just asking ... I think I'd like a little context to put that in just for my own purposes. Just to understand how those sizes might add to the existing.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, I believe they were derived from the total number of units in our project, not Village-wide.

Chairman Cameron: No, obviously.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just a context of how many one-bedroom affordables, how many two-bedroom affordables, et cetera will exist in the Village. It's just to put it in the context overall of what exists. They're not saying that the 1 one and 1 two isn't acceptable, they're just trying to get some more information.

Chairman Cameron: And you don't have to release this information.

Mr. Baldwin: I don't need to get this information?

Chairman Cameron: No, we have to get this information.

Village Attorney Whitehead: They're listening to us and they're discussing what they're going to give us.

Boardmember Sullivan: Linda, thank you for continuing to try to get my ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: I'm sorry.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, no. I thought this was a simple request. But it was not clear, and thank you for helping.

The one thing I appreciated, seeing the open space diagram ... because it caused me to ... it was actually confusing because it wasn't matching up with what you were proposing. There's another drawing I'd like to talk about also, which is your coverage drawing on sheet 9, which

is really a diagram that you're using to talk about the impact of the side yards on your property. I'm not sure the coverage is 80 percent. I think it's more ... the reason being ...

Mr. Baldwin: It's 87.8.

Boardmember Sullivan: I know. I don't think it's that because when I look at the site plan of the mews level I'm seeing a coverage of almost 100 percent of the site. What I'm looking at is the structures themselves. It looks like the small gardens behind the east ...

Mr. Baldwin: The gardens behind the east group is the only non-coverage area.

Boardmember Sullivan: But they're shown as patios. Is that a hard surface, or not?

Mr. Baldwin: Patio is coverage?

Boardmember Sullivan: It depends on what's on it. My question is, is it paved?

Mr. Baldwin: Well, we'll delete those patios. They can be gravel then.

Boardmember Sullivan: Oh, gravel would be ...

Mr. Baldwin: That would be coverage, too?

Boardmember Sullivan: I would think so.

Building Inspector Minozzi: No.

Boardmember Sullivan: What I'd like to see is a drawing that indicates where the coverage is.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, that's what that drawing nine was all about.

Boardmember Sullivan: I know. But when you look at that drawing, it's not clear what you consider coverage. Because on it, you have the setbacks and other things you're trying to use to indicate other issues. So a clean drawing that shows what you think is coverage would be helpful.

Mr. Baldwin: All right.

Boardmember Sullivan: We've run into situations where walls ...

Mr. Baldwin: If you're saying that a patio is coverage, sitting on grade, then you're right: the coverage is bigger than 87.8.

Boardmember Sullivan: Correct, yeah. I was looking at the mews level because that's the ... correct? I'm sorry, I'm talking about the drawing that was on page nine, and I think it was.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The coverage?

Mr. Baldwin: Sheet nine. I didn't know we had to resubmit that. I thought that drawing was ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Well like I said, I'd like to see the 80-ish percent indicated somehow just so we can understand it.

Back to the open space, what's being indicated – and I don't think it's in your calculations – there are roofs that are not accessible being indicated as coverage, as open space.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I have the same problem. That diagram has no dimensions. One can't really do any proper calculations.

Mr. Baldwin: It is a diagram, that's true. And it relates to the drawings, which are dimensions. But if you want us to dimension every different surface in there to show ... we'll do a diagram which shows coverage, period,

Boardmember Sullivan: Correct, that'd be great.

Mr. Baldwin: and not coverage. We'll dimension that and give you the total area.

Boardmember Sullivan: That'd be helpful just so it's clear.

Mr. Baldwin: All right.

Boardmember Sullivan: That'll be very helpful.

I guess the last thing in this line is, looking at your tables on sheet 10 – which are very helpful – I believe you miscalculated the parking. There's a couple things – and I'll share these with Buddy so he can give them to you – but I think your total you are obliged to have is 31 spaces. I think you miscalculated just by not picking up the bedroom sizes and you're

slightly on the parking spaces. But I'll get that to Buddy so he can get it to you just so you have it.

Some of the units themselves – W-1, 2 through 5, S-1, 2 and 3 – all are ones that look like they could be another bedroom size very easily, where something like a study could be turned into a bedroom. Which doesn't have a huge impact, per se, except it potentially could add a couple parking spaces and some additional open space. I'll share that with Buddy, as well, so he just has it and you can see if you can accommodate at least the open space.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I had exactly the same observation as I was going through those calculations, and I'll share them with Buddy as well.

Mr. Baldwin: Will you? Please, thank you.

Boardmember Sullivan: On sheet one, I'd like to see the fan room, which is called out ... there's another level of some type that you're using for mechanical space. I'd like to see that (inaudible).

Mr. Baldwin: It's a mechanical space for ventilating the garage, and that system obviously is not designed yet.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, just to be ...

Mr. Baldwin: So we've shown a space for it, that's it.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, you've shown ... talking about some space, it would be helpful to see the plan.

Mr. Baldwin: All right.

Boardmember Sullivan: Just for the sake of knowing about it. And I'm just interested if you could also indicate like where the elevator mechanical room's going to be, just sort of some of the other ancillary spaces.

Mr. Baldwin: I thought we showed the mechanical room. The mechanical room is shown. It's a hydraulic elevator.

Boardmember Sullivan: Mm-hmm, and where is the room at?

Mr. Baldwin: The mechanical room's at the garage level in a closet behind the stair, and it's

labeled.

Boardmember Sullivan: Is it? OK, I overlooked it. I'll look for that.

We talked about the details on the fences. I guess my last thing – and I'm not going to through all this stuff – right now, based on what you have determined with the state about not having to have an accessible northern exit, is what is on your drawings what you should be looking at as what to propose or not to the Board of Trustees?

Mr. Baldwin: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear that.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'll repeat it. You don't have to have anyone else interpret for me if you can't hear it. Right now, you determined that you do not have to have an accessible entrance from the north. So what you have on the drawings is what you're proposing we look at, either to approve or not, recommend to the Board of Trustees or not?

Mr. Baldwin: Right.

Boardmember Sullivan: OK. Could we have some more information on slopes, handrails, the extension from where the stair lands, how that's going to go to Southside?

Mr. Baldwin: Yeah, certainly we can give you some details of the path and the steps.

Boardmember Sullivan: It would be useful, potentially, to see an elevation as well. To have an elevation of it.

Mr. Baldwin: Oh which, the stairs?

Boardmember Sullivan: Yeah, just so we understand what it looks like on Village property. The other thing that would be helpful is to understand if any trees are going to be removed to accommodate that.

Mr. Baldwin: Certainly we'll do that.

Boardmember Sullivan: I just think having more detail ... right now, I'm not sure what the extent ...

Mr. Baldwin: I don't believe there are any significant trees there. There is a stair already that goes up about 5 feet from the parking lot. And we propose the same location, just extending the stairs.

Chairman Cameron: It would be useful also to know things like maintenance obligations of shoveling snow. I assume you guys are going to pick up that obligation to bring it down to the station parking lot.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, would you like a draft easement agreement?

Chairman Cameron: That would be terrific, but just a brief agreement of what you're doing. Because when we package this thing up – assuming we're sending it to the Board and asking them to approve it – I think we usually look upon the people here who are design professionals to have put a package together which they can more easily ... where we'll actually look at it and decide whether ...

Mr. Baldwin: Well, I'm happy to prepare a draft easement agreement which would cover all of that.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Regarding access to the Zinsser parking lot from the north side, I've seen two different diagrams; one that indicates the path sloping to the east and one indicating that it slopes to the west. My personal preference would be to have the path sloping to the west to get to the Zinsser parking area.

Mr. Baldwin: Yeah, I'm unaware of any drawing showing it sloping to the east. It would be hard to do. You're sort of doing uphill there. In fact, the path is largely on our property until the extreme northwest corner of our property. Then it goes on Village property and it only goes something like 38 feet, then makes a right turn to the stair and straight down to the parking lot. At that point, the total drop left is only something like 9 or 10 feet.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But he's going to provide that in detail.

Mr. Baldwin: I will provide a detailed drawing of those stairs.

Boardmember Alligood: I just want to make a comment about the notion of no significant trees next to the parking lot. I think they may not meet the definition of a certain circumference, but there is value in having a small bit of green next to what is essentially a pretty ugly parking lot. It's a sea of asphalt and hundreds of cars. So I think that should be taken into consideration, that whatever comes down there doesn't take down a whole strip of trees. I think those of us who saw that huge swath of trees come down on what is private property – we didn't have any way to stop the owner from pulling them down – but there's a huge difference between what it looked like before and what it is now.

Mr. Baldwin: Right.

Boardmember Alligood: So we certainly wouldn't want to see some significant strip of trees taken down on Village property in order to accommodate the stairs.

Mr. Baldwin: Our intention is not to take down any trees at all on Village properties unless they're right in the middle of our path. But there's nothing significant in the way that I've seen. There is quite a large tree at the bottom of the steps on the right, and the whole idea is to bring the steps down in front of that tree and then turn to the west to avoid the tree. That's the biggest tree in that area, and that shows on our plan now.

Boardmember Alligood: OK, just want to make sure ...

Chairman Cameron: Yes, we're actually hopeful that the people in the parking lot can't see your building, as wonderful as it may be.

Boardmember Sullivan: I guess one small aesthetic thing is I am uncomfortable with the elevation on Washington Street because of the balconies. I think they're out of character with the rest of the area, and I think we have some examples in the Village of balconies that have been put on the front of buildings on Main commercial and public areas and they're not an attractive addition. I just want to be on record to be looking at that would be appreciated. I think they're kind of like a motel, they don't really have a lot of character that's equal to what's around it. So just for what that's worth.

Mr. Baldwin: I'm sorry, I'm ...

Chairman Cameron: Wants you to look more carefully at the balconies on Washington because they are considered by some to be ugly.

Mr. Baldwin: Ugly.

Boardmember Sullivan: And out of character.

Mr. Baldwin: Yeah.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Better phrased "out of character."

Chairman Cameron: There are few words possible. Anyway.

Boardmember Sullivan: So others might feel the same?

Chairman Cameron: I'd just like to go back, if I can, to the flags. The sooner you get up those flags the better chance we have of going and looking at it before you want to come back to us next.

Mr. Baldwin: Oh, absolutely. Yeah.

Chairman Cameron: And if you go up there, and the flags are up and it doesn't look good, you should think about how you can shorten your buildings. Because, quite frankly, it better look good. You did a great job on the other two sets of buildings, thank you very much. We got there, and I for one am very happy with the west and the east buildings. So the sooner the better. I'm just saying do it as soon as you can.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, we shall. The neighbors to the east stated that if we lowered the west houses they'd be happy with the project, and we've done that. I have looked at the 3-D model another time, and the encroachment of the view posed by those four buildings is very, very minimal.

Chairman Cameron: Well, we'll look at it. That's what the flags are for. I mean, I must say, seeing the red lines on the outside of the buildings, I always think of a mews as being these cuddly little buildings. And those are quite large buildings, when you think about it. I understand costs and everything, and you want to get in more units, but I think we can look at it very carefully when the flags are up. To me, that's the big issue still sitting out there.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think the issue of giving over Village property for the use is also an option. I mean, there's another way they can accommodate ... they don't need that northern exit. They could accommodate by making an area refuge on their property, a place where people could go and be rescued. That isn't an exception to the code. It doesn't need a variance, it's an option. So, I mean, something to be considered is whether that ... I see that as an issue, Jamie, too. Later on today we're going to look at other Village property.

Chairman Cameron: The reason they had seven people on the Planning Board is we all have our favorite things. Trails are one of my favorite things, so there you are.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And I will second Kathy. I would appreciate if you'd rethink the porches a little bit, too.

Female Voice: Could you repeat that? Sorry.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I was just seconding Kathy's description of the porches.

Female Voice: [Off-mic].

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yeah, I am not feeling it completely.

Boardmember Ambrozek: So I reviewed the SWPPP – and this is really just a nit – and in the formulas that are used on pages 9, 11 and 13 of appendix A and pages 10, 12 and 14 of appendix B you have a formula that refers to "Q(a)" – capital "Q," lower case "a" – and I believe in every instance where they refer to capital Q, lower case "a" it should be capital "A," lower case "q." There's also a formula presented there where the spacing is very wide and it makes it difficult to comprehend the formula that's being presented: and that's capital "T," lower case "c."

Mr. Baldwin: Which page is that on?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Also on the same pages: equals – left braces – capital "L," lower case "f" divided by capital "V" – right braces – divided by 3,600. In every instance, all of these are represented the same way. This is really a nit that there is nothing mathematically incorrect.

Mr. Baldwin: It's the way it's presented.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes, simply the way it's presented.

So, yes, it was very tedious reading through that document. But I appreciate very much that you are proposing to put in retention basins that will reduce the overall runoff from the property beyond what it is today.

Mr. Baldwin: Right.

Boardmember Ambrozek: And I also very much like the use of the green roofs. I have some little questions there, as well. The document states that these green roofs are warranted – the materials for the green roofs are warranted – for 20 years. And in order to maintain the warranty, there are three site visits that are going to be required per year to perform what they call "required tests" to keep the roof under warranty. I presume that will be the responsibility of ... is that going to be the responsibility of the individual unit owners, or the collective?

Mr. Baldwin: It'll be a collective condominium corporation responsibility.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, in that case I would actually very much like to not have the roofs accessed by individual roof hatches, but my making them ... what I really want is to discourage access to green roofs because they can be delicate.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, all we have are skylights that are operable over the stairwells. There is no access ... you'd need a high ladder to get up there and actually get out. Any maintenance of the roof would be done by ladders from the outside.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Oh, OK.

Mr. Baldwin: There is not access to any vegetated ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: So what are called "roof hatches" are just skylights.

Mr. Baldwin: They're just skylights, operable skylights. On the west houses where there are not vegetated roofs, there we have accessible stairs and a roof hatch.

Boardmember Ambrozek: So the west units do not have green roofs?

Mr. Baldwin: Well, some do. I can't remember ... which one?

Gillian Anderson, Baldwin & Franklin: [Off-mic].

Mr. Baldwin: Oh, yes, some do have a mixture of terrace and green roofs.

Ms. Anderson: [Off-mic].

Mr. Baldwin: No, there are none that are mixed. There will be no access from inside the unit to a vegetated roof

Boardmember Ambrozek: So all the units will have green roofs and there will not be any ...

Mr. Baldwin: No.

Chairman Cameron: No.

Mr. Baldwin: Certain units have green roofs. If you look at the landscape ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, as Kathleen pointed out, unfortunately we didn't get all

the diagrams.

Mr. Baldwin: No, the roof plan very clearly shows the vegetated roofs.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Those are copies ...

Mr. Baldwin: Sheet five, I believe, is the roof plan. Sheet 15 is a new open space plan which also shows them.

Chairman Cameron: We're going to keep rolling along.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes, that's fine.

Chairman Cameron: OK. So the one thing we need to decide today which we haven't decided yet is whether we're going to get a traffic consultant or not. We put that issue up, and then we sort of dropped it. We just have to make a decision because we got to keep this thing rolling so Ned can go home sometime.

Mr. Baldwin: Since my client will end up paying for the traffic consultant ...

Chairman Cameron: That's true.

Mr. Baldwin: ... I would like to make a plea that you don't need them.

Boardmember Alligood: That's not how the process works, sorry.

Chairman Cameron: I don't think we need to do a traffic study, but I think we need somebody who's a professional on the construction of these sloped driveways to give us advice. I don't think it's going to be as expensive as you seem to be concerned about.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, as far as the turning radiuses and getting off the street into the driveway, both in and out, I discussed that with Chief Visalli. He thought it was all workable. It's just like any other driveway.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I guess, for me, I take pause. We have a civil engineer whom this study is recommending we have a professional look at it. The incline on Washington is severe, the driveway's inclined. I mean, I just feel when we have a civil engineer telling us we should have a traffic professional look at it – and I don't mean full-blown volume counts – I think somebody should look at it.

Mr. Baldwin: Well, I might be able to get JMC, who did the SWPPP, to do it. I believe they do that kind of thing.

Building Inspector Minozzi: It would be a consultant to the Village.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah.

Boardmember Sullivan: If JMC would do it, we would have someone to do it.

Chairman Cameron: So that's not a good idea. OK, I think we should do it. But I'm just suggesting that we don't need to have somebody doing car counts on Washington.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, Jamie, I think it's very clear ...

Chairman Cameron: It's an engineering, kind of traffic-turning, thing.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, it's to evaluate the driveway and how it intersects with the street and the sidewalk.

Chairman Cameron: Exactly, I agree.

Boardmember Sullivan: And also, I think, to take a look at these lights and horns and God knows what else is being added on as signals for people. I mean, this is a whole wacky – I'm sorry, my word, not anyone else's – system. I just want to make sure it's going to be safe and it makes sense. Everyone is like let's put a light here. Well, great, but what's it going to do?

Chairman Cameron: Get one of those traffic people in front of the high school in their spare time. Anyway.

Boardmember Sullivan: They do a very good job.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Hahn has indicated they have people they work with that they can have somebody do this sort of under their ... which is good because they can explain ... I think they understand what the issues are.

Chairman Cameron: So I'm going to take it I just got a "yes" vote from the Board on that?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yes.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I would say yes.

Chairman Cameron: OK, we're trying to move along and we have about 40 or 50 people here who didn't come to listen to this discussion and have been very patient. I'm trying to ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: The only thing you have to give us, Ned, is just a little bit more detail on how that light and whatnot is going to work with the garage and the pedestrians and everything.

Mr. Baldwin: Yeah, I will.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Because Hahn was very confused about that.

Mr. Baldwin: I realize ... I spoke to him today about it.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Oh, you did speak to him? Very good, thank you.

Chairman Cameron: So we'll see the flags almost before we know it. We'll most likely see you in a month. And maybe we'll have a Christmas present, I don't know.

Thank you very much.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And just to stick with how the Board has proceeded in the past, I think what you're going to get at this point from this board is not necessarily a full site plan approval. They will make their SEQRA determination, they will do the referral to the Zoning Board and their referral to the Board of Trustees and ARB. Then when you get all of those, in case anything is changed or in case there is any more site plan details that this board still wants to look at, you can come back. But at that point, everything goes simultaneously.

Chairman Cameron: Right.

Mr. Baldwin: Thank you very much.

Chairman Cameron: Great, thank you.

VI. OLD BUSINESS - None

VII. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Hastings Affordable House Development Fund – Informal review and discussion of Preliminary Site Plan for 69 Ravensdale Road (northeast corner of Kent Avenue and Ravensdale Road).

Chairman Cameron: We're now moving to a discussion item, Hastings Affordable House Development Fund. It's an informal review and discussion of preliminary site plan for 69 Ravensdale, the northeast corner of Kent Avenue and Ravensdale Road.

Sue Smith, Affordable Housing Committee: Let me begin with sort of some bit of opening information. In preparation for coming here tonight, we held a neighborhood meeting on November 7 at the site as a way to explain our proposal to the residents and the neighbors who are most affected by the plan. Many of them are here tonight and I'm sure will express their particular concerns: certainly, access, safety, drainage and erosion control issues, among others.

It was clear to the Affordable Housing Committee that many people do not know what we call "affordable housing," what it actually is. Briefly, I'd like to just summarize the answer to that question and maybe it'll be interesting for some of you also. I have a flier somewhere here that is available to anybody who wants it. It was with the agendas, I'm not sure where it went. We'll use it at the next meeting.

This Affordable Housing topic, with capital "A," capital "H," means *"housing units created in Westchester County with county and state aid which service a specific economic portion of the population. For ownership, the maximum income is 80 percent of Westchester median income, which is currently \$83,000 for a four-person household. The minimum income would be approximately \$75,000. For rentals, the maximum income is 60 percent of median income, which is currently \$43,500 for a one-person household, ranging to \$62,220 for a four-person household. The minimum incomes for rentals would range from about \$37,000 to \$56,000, depending on the household size."* So these are people with jobs and with some funds.

"The affordable houses in Hastings would have deed restrictions, so that for a 100-year period they can only be sold or rented to other income-eligible households. They cannot be sold for more than original price plus a cost of living increase and any capital improvements that are approved by the Affordable Housing Committee. They must be owner-occupied and cannot rise with the housing market, as everybody else's home can. Therefore, the affordable home cannot be used as a comparable for the purpose of appraisal and will never affect the market value of any market-rate homes. They would only be comparable to other affordable houses with the same deed restrictions. The choice of owners and renters is done by a lottery process. There is a wide marketing effort, mandated by the 2009 Westchester

County settlement in the HUD lawsuit, in which Hastings is named as a municipality" – they must follow that.

"Applications are due on a specific date and are placed in order by a blind lottery draw. Then the income eligibility process begins, with number one and two and so down the line." For instance, with the affordable condominiums at number 52 Washington Avenue there were 55 applicants. "Three of the first six lottery numbers qualified and await move-in." Sometimes you go down a long list and you need like 50 for three units because so many people are actually not income-qualified when it really comes down to it. "These people have jobs and references, and the ability to manage the cost of a home, confirmed in a detailed income eligibility process. Only 33 percent of their income can be used for housing expenses. The application process is managed by out of town affordable housing consultants who are trained in the requirements of the funding agents." And I'd have to say it's very heavily regulated by the funding sources.

"To date, we've completed 21 units in Hastings, with another 14 approved" – and we will get the information about the bedroom count – "and those are under construction on Saw Mill River Road" – you see when you drive by there – "and about to begin on Farragut. We do our best to hire good architects and use designs that fit the local neighborhood."

So that's a brief summary of what it is. I'm glad to answer questions at some point, maybe not tonight because of the hour. This proposed project you all understand, I think, since we've been to you before. It's very hard to find land or a building lot, or a building even, in Hastings that is inexpensive enough for us to acquire. We cannot compete with market prices. This is a 0.7-acre property, and we find both those qualities here, land and building opportunities, as well as a building. *"The existing house has been on and off the market for the last four years. It is both very large, with an unusual layout, and in need of repairs that gave us the opportunity to agree with the owners on a price which the county planning department would accept for acquisition funding. This is financially dependent upon being able to create four units on the site. The plan shows the proposed use of the site. It includes the rehabilitation of the existing house into an owner-occupied four-bedroom house with a two-bedroom accessory apartment." That's the gray one on the left.*

"The rent from the apartment also helps the owner carry the mortgage and the taxes. The newer, much smaller house" – which is the pink one – "would be a three-bedroom owner-occupied home with a one-bedroom accessory apartment. We are mindful that the Planning Board requires off-street parking for every unit. We are not in a contract for purchase" – we're working on that – "and therefore we cannot formally come to the Board with a proposal."

But at this point, we would like the informal discussion. It's an unusual property, and because it's on Ravensdale it has that tight curve. It's not safe to come out, we feel, onto Ravensdale so we've suggested a rather unorthodox solution with a driveway that runs parallel to the road. At this point, I'd like to turn it over to our volunteer committee member architect, Christina Griffin, for your more specific questions.

Ms. Griffin: I just want to explain that this is a conceptual plan at this moment. This is showing, in gray, the existing house that can be broken into two pieces very easily because there's a four-bedroom portion on this side – which would be the main house – and then two bedrooms on this side, with a large living and kitchen area on the lower level. This would be the accessory apartment for this house. There's an existing garage that allows two parking spaces for this house.

Our plan is to subdivide this property. We have about, I think, around 33,000 square feet so we could have another lot that would have a new single-family house with another accessory apartment. This house would be much smaller in footprint. The idea is to minimize the site development cost by having a very small footprint for this house. It'll be a three-bedroom, somewhere between a 1,600 and 1,800 square foot home. There'll be an accessory apartment, one-bedroom apartment, here that has a footprint of about 600 square feet. The house has a footprint of about 900 square feet.

These footprints are small because what we wanted to do is put this on the area of this lot – it has a very gentle slope – and stay away from the steep slopes. We looked very hard at how you can get access to this property. We looked at the idea of coming off of Ravensdale. And because of the safety considerations, the traffic flow, the lack of sight line and also the removal of rock that would need to happen to bring a driveway off of Ravensdale we decided to look at kind of an unconventional way of handling the driveway so it would run through this property. There would be an easement through this property to get access to this house.

We're still studying the property and we don't know if we're going to do this as two driveways. We might link this driveway up with this driveway that's here because we want to try to meet the zoning code in every way possible. So we're still taking a look at that because we know the maximum driveway width is 24 feet. This driveway is going to provide two parking spaces for the accessory apartment and will provide three parking spaces that are needed by code for the house and the accessory apartment. We have preliminary analysis for steep slopes. This one lot, we're going to call this lot A, is about 16,000 square feet. Once you take the deductions for steep slopes we're able to get a buildable net area of 12,000 square feet. On lot B, we have an area of about 15,000 square feet. We have to take deductions for steep slopes, and we'll end up with a net buildable area just over 10,000. So the idea is to meet the zoning code as much as we can.

We also have another sketch showing just some ideas for grading. We really looked hard to see if we could minimize the amount of cut and fill. We want to stay away from the rock and keep as many trees in this wooded area as possible. The driveway is running parallel to the grade so it'd be a little bit of cut and fill to make this driveway work at a reasonable grade. This parking area is up on this area that's fairly level – I mean, it has a very gentle slope – then we'd have to do a little bit of fill around the parking area. This house would also have some property, like a yard, in the back which also is an area not as steep. And the accessory apartment may have a deck that's going to be above that hilly area.

We have some very rough thoughts on drainage. We might handle the CULTEC underneath this little filled area. Because we're keeping all this vegetation there, it's going to help with any kind of runoff that may be outside the CULTEC we provide. This is a sketch, a 3-D sketch, just showing the existing house with the proposed driveway coming through. We would have evergreen screening of the two parking areas they're providing. Then tucked in the back on top of the hill is the new single-family residence and the accessory apartment. I brought some photographs, and the next one is the same view that the 3-D sketch is based on showing the rock on the property. We know there's a lot of rock on this property, which is why we really didn't think we should be coming down through the bottom of the hill. Which is in addition to, of course, the whole traffic safety problem of having a driveway off of Ravensdale that we didn't want to consider.

This is the existing two-car garage that provides parking for the main house. These are just views as you walk around the building. These photographs are almost following the driveway that we're proposing. This is going around the house. This is going in front of where the accessory apartment would be on the old house. These are just views of the area that's tucked up and back on top of the hill, which is where we'd like to locate the new house. This is another view of the area, and the last view is just looking at the hillside. This is the wooded hillside we show on the site plan that we'd like to preserve, which is this area on the site right here.

We're here today just to see if you have any comments, any kind of direction or input at this point in time.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I have some questions, going back to the concept, about affordable. You've got two houses on two lots, both with accessory apartments that are rented by the purchaser of the affordable house, and that person gains the rent?

Ms. Smith: That's right. It has to be an owner-occupied home, and then the smaller apartment would be rented. They gain their rent as income.

Boardmember O'Reilly: What does that do to their qualifying income?

Ms. Smith: That's calculated in as part of their housing expenses, I believe. I'm not exactly sure about that, but it's an interesting question how that's ... it's a complicated equation to figure out the affordable housing income. But I'll find out more specifically how that works.

Boardmember O'Reilly: And the question I never remember the answer to, how long does their qualifying income last? A person buys affordable housing, something improves in their life.

Ms. Smith: Right, they hit the lottery or something? I think the reality is that because they can never gain the market value of a home there isn't a lot of incentive, as your income rises, to stay if you have any financial alternative.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Then it goes on the market as an affordable house.

Ms. Smith: Affordable, and has to go through the whole ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: Does it come back to the committee?

Ms. Smith: Yes, and they have to pass through us for income eligibility.

Boardmember O'Reilly: OK. I have one more, which I'll remember if somebody else has a question.

Boardmember Bass: I have some site plan questions. The distance between the existing garage and the northern property line, what is that distance?

Ms. Griffin: The existing garage?

Boardmember Bass: Yeah.

Ms. Griffin: Here I think is around 20 to 22 feet.

Boardmember Bass: And the distance from the main house to the property line?

Ms. Griffin: In the back?

Boardmember Bass: Yeah.

Ms. Griffin: At the nearest point, it's 11 feet.

Boardmember Bass: And the distance from the intersection to where you're proposing the driveway for the secondary house?

Ms. Griffin: From this corner?

Boardmember Bass: No, coming off Ravensdale from the intersection.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Kent and Ravensdale.

Ms. Griffin: Here?

Village Attorney Whitehead: The distance to the new driveway.

Boardmember Bass: Where's the driveway entrance on the ... what's the distance from there to the corner?

Ms. Griffin: Probably 30 feet.

Boardmember Bass: And our standard?

Building Inspector Minozzi: There is none.

Boardmember Bass: Other professionals on the Board, 100 feet normally is driveway?

Chairman Cameron: Oh, you mean the left of the driveway.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: From an intersection.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You have [off-mic] that aren't even 100 feet wide, so 100 feet is ...

Boardmember Bass: And the reason why you chose that driveway entrance as opposed to bringing it in from the north along the ...

Ms. Griffin: That's north. You mean bringing it from Ravensdale?

Boardmember Bass: No, from the side street, from Kent.

Ms. Griffin: Yeah, we did look at that. There are really three options: this way, what we're presenting, and then coming through Ravensdale. It's just too narrow. There's a kitchen in the way.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Ms. Griffin: It's a bottleneck, plus we felt this driveway would be going right along the long wall of the house. So kitchen and bedrooms, it seemed like it would really take away from that house. This doesn't seem like it's used as much, and we looked really hard at this. Of course it's another option, but you have to sort of weigh the benefits and the disadvantages of both options. It's a difficult property.

Boardmember Bass: Can I ask questions?

Chairman Cameron: Sure.

Boardmember Bass: In terms of the condition of the house, what's the estimated cost to bring it up to code? I would assume that the condition of the house is why it hasn't sold for the last three or four years.

Ms. Smith: I think so, as well as the unusual layout. It was meant for a very large family. We estimate between \$250,000 to \$300,000 to fix that house up and create the accessory apartment.

Boardmember Bass: And the county's affordable housing program will fund the acquisition and the rehab?

Ms. Smith: Yes. We haven't formalized that, but yes they're interested in pursuing this, without understanding those prices.

Boardmember Bass: So the purchase price for the affordable housing tenant or tenants isn't predicated on the cost of the land and the cost of the rehab.

Ms. Smith: No, no. That's fixed, based on their formulas of what people can afford within that income range. The county will regain the sale price of it, but most of it is in the form of a grant; they will never recapture it.

Boardmember Bass: I haven't paid recent attention between the county exec's fight with HUD and the consent decree. How does that affect the financing of this project?

Ms. Smith: It means the planning board's very eager to create housing, and that's one reason they're looking at this favorably.

Boardmember Bass: Right. I know the planning board might, but the county exec ...

Ms. Smith: The county executive, well, he wants to cut arts and all kinds of things so I'm not sure. But the planning board has the obligation – is trying to fulfill the obligation – for 750 units by 2017.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The administration is on board with trying to meet the time frame. The money that's available ... obviously there's no CDBG money available except for maybe the rehab money that would come from the state. But there's no county ... that's what HUD took away.

Boardmember Bass: Right, I know.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But there are other sources of funding the county has and is making available through the board of legislators and the administration for affordable housing.

Boardmember Bass: In terms of our participation in the affordable housing program, what is our goal in terms of number of units in the Village?

Ms. Smith: It's a goal for the county as a whole – the 750 units under the settlement.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Within the 31 target communities.

Ms. Smith: Within those communities that are named, that's right.

Boardmember Bass: OK, because the last time we discussed this was during the Comp Plan hearings. The old target was 10 percent of new development, and we had a goal of 87 or 90 units which implied we had to have 900 units built in Hastings, which was unrealistic.

Ms. Smith: The numbers were really before the settlement. There was a Rutgers plan back in, I want to say, the last part of the '90s maybe that said our piece of the county – our fair share in Hastings – would be about 30 units. Later, there was a number of 100 units. But they've never been mandated in any way. They were simply rule of thumb, trying to encourage people to take their share. Which means, of course, that up-county a lot of communities aren't doing anything – not just up-county. But Hastings has tried to do

whatever we can do. So there is no mandated number for us.

Boardmember Bass: What is our objective in terms of reaching a number? Your committee must have ...

Ms. Smith: I don't think ... we haven't talked about a number. We're just looking at the opportunities. What we're able to do is generally these very small projects, which sort of feel like a drop in the bucket unless you're the family that's moving in. Then you're really happy. Something like the 12 units on Saw Mill River Road is awesome for Hastings, or the 14 units at 422 Warburton. But generally they're going to be small unless the waterfront gets developed. It's going to be small things with a couple of units like this. Or the two houses down on Pinecrest that each have an accessory apartment also, something like that.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I thought of my other question. I've seen worse houses than this one sell for a price. So even if you redo it, why do you think it's going to sell now as an affordable unit? I mean, the price varied a bit on this property, it never moved. I've seen worse houses sold quickly, and this one sort of sits there.

Ms. Smith: Well, it's not in good condition. It's kind of a '50s sort of house. And it also has this very strange layout because it was a very big family. My sense is it's not so attractive to people these days. But for an affordable family coming in, when it becomes a four-bedroom house instead of a six-bedroom house, it'll be very attractive. For the condos on Washington Avenue we had 55 applications.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Well, you might be right. I was just wondering why, since it was such an odd situation – you drive past that all the time and the sign's been in the ground for a couple years – you think, well, it didn't sell so why it is going to sell now, even though there's going to be more houses put on that lot. One of the attractions, I would have thought, would have been the space around it. But it didn't sell.

The other question is, isn't there a certain amount of rock in there?

Ms. Smith: Oh, yes. This is Hastings.

Boardmember O'Reilly: But what problem is that going to present?

Ms. Griffin: That's why we're [off-mic].

Ms. Smith: We're trying to work with the rock, so to speak.

Ms. Griffin: That's why this is on top ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: It's all on top of rock.

Ms. Griffin: We had a scheme developed coming through Ravensdale with a turnaround. There's so many rock outcroppings, we are assuming if we did that we would have to remove rock. Even though this doesn't seem like an inexpensive solution because of the length of the driveway, it's still on top of the rock because we don't want to cut the rock. Then when we come up here, this little clearing up here is on top of the rock. We're planning to keep the house above it, the little rock outcropping here. But we don't want to cut down, we don't want to bring the house lower than we're showing it.

Chairman Cameron: It's not a bad driveway for a gain of five parking spots when you get right down to it, though.

Boardmember Bass: I have one more question on affordability. Is there any weighing in the lottery for Hastings residents?

Ms. Smith: As a result of the settlement there is none. We used to have that in the original, when we started the construction down on Pinecrest and when 422 was done. Those were done with preferences for Hastings residents, and particularly for firemen and municipal employees and school employees. We can still do that on those, but anything that's built after the settlement was assigned has to have no preferences and be marketed widely. I will say we have an interest list of anybody who was looking for affordable housing in Hastings. We have about 100 names on it, and that's been a fairly constant number over the years; some come off, some come on. A lot of them are from Hastings, which is very interesting to me. A lot of them are still Hastings people who want to move who are renting or want to move within Hastings.

Boardmember Bass: And how do you define, advertise-wise, "widely"?

Ms. Smith: Widely is defined by the settlement.

Boardmember Bass: I'm sorry, getting tired.

Ms. Smith: It's defined by the settlement. It's marketed all around the greater metropolitan area and Westchester County. Who you have to go to, it's all prescribed.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's very complicated, the whole marketing requirement.

Ms. Smith: Yeah.

Boardmember Alligood: The simple notion is that we are trying to break away from being exclusionary, which is what Westchester is because of our zoning. So the marketing is meant to overcome that barrier, which is that we are trying to be open to people from the broader region.

Chairman Cameron: I would guess, with the number of buildings that are going condo in the town, we'd probably get an increased number of people looking for an opportunity like this in Hastings because they're pushed out of fairly low-rent buildings. Our development has been people taking some of our lesser buildings and converting them to much more fancy type things.

I'll entertain comments from to audience. I also have one letter here, and if the person's here I won't read it. But if they are here, it's Krys Boccumini. They wrote a letter in, and I'll just read the letter. It says:

"Hello, I live about 500 feet from 69 Ravensdale. I was able to attend some of the meetings, but other commitments infringed. I also participated in Mr. Kadala's survey and I indicated that I was in favor of the proposal with a concern of safety. I've always talked about the neighborhoods within Hastings – judges, phone installers, teachers, lawyers, nurses – all living next to each other. The prohibitive cost of homeownership impacts the current and future likelihood of this homogeneity. I have some comments about the proposed discussion at the upcoming Planning Board meeting. My concerns seem to mostly concern the proposed driveway and additional parking spaces on this property."

"One, the plans indicate the driveway outletting (sic) on Kent Avenue very close to the corner. Any auto entering Kent from Ravensdale is at risk of a crash. Two, the driveway will have to be cleared of snow and ice during storms. Because of the income limitations, some likely professional snow plowing will be an option. It's not an impossible situation, but would require a bit of planning and teamwork from the occupants of the properties. Three, the driveway parking spaces will reduce the absorbency of the ground, which would increase runoff. I understand that water already cascades down to the properties on Clinton during storms."

"Thank you for letting me share my thoughts about this site."

Krys Boccumini
28 Fenwick Road

Chairman Cameron: Probably mangled the last name. I apologize.

Anyone in the audience like to comment, please come forward and state your name and address.

Matthew Black, 16 Clinton Avenue: I live directly sort of behind this. I'm just going to use my notes so I don't forget what I'm about to say, so forgive me. I was at the Board of Trustees meetings, I did share a lot of questions. They may have been shared with you from Trustee Armacost, who said she would. If you haven't, I apologize that you haven't received them.

Like many of my neighbors, I am very concerned. I'm not against affordable housing, that's not me. But I am concerned that there's been a lack of transparency. It's interesting. Talking about the marketing, there has been no marketing to the neighborhood; there is no marketing on the site. There's so much information that we need to have as residents, as part of the community, that has not been shared by the Affordable Housing Committee. Many questions, and I'll share some of them with you. This came up with the conversation on the house, as well.

Given the fact that there is a realtor and a builder affiliated with the Affordable Housing Committee, what is the process to ensure that there is no hint of impropriety? They should be recused from this activity. Also, it was brought up that agency disclosure forms should have been signed. When asked, that was not provided and we still don't know if that has been provided thus far. I agree with you that given the house has been on the market for many years why hasn't the price of the house been lowered \$250,000? I don't understand that. I live on Clinton, I did a full gut renovation of my home. The price was lowered and we put the work in to renovate the home. So I don't understand that.

What I also don't understand is, what are the costs to the town. I understand the house would be funded, but what about the building committee or office, or police, or traffic. You know, who's going to have to ... what costs come to Hastings out of this that we have to spend, and shouldn't that be considered by the residents? I'm sorry, I meant to say Building Department, Public Works, police and safety – who pays for that, that's not clear. Has a traffic study been done? This is a terrible road and I'm sure you all know this. People speed up the street here and, in fact, I just saw there's a "slow" sign that's on the bridge that's actually facing Clinton.

It actually doesn't face on Ravensdale anymore when you drive past it. That needs to be fixed. So people zip up here, there's no way to slow them down.

Where will children play? Let's just start there. There's no space on there for children to play. If a ball comes down out of the driveway it's going to roll into the street. And this was brought up – kids will run straight down that hill right into that road. I used to walk home there and I was terrified to walk home at night on that street. What happens during the dark, as well?

Let's also talk about parking. We're talking possibly nine cars, right? So if we have a four-bedroom, a two-bedroom, a three-bedroom, a one- ... that's what we add up. Because as kids get older, they have cars. Where will all those cars go? Then what about guests? I assume they'll all have friends. Where will they all park on that street? When you do the construction, where will the construction people park? Where will all the construction vehicles go to build on this property? This traffic will be a nightmare on this street for all the work that has to get done on this. And to build another home, that's not a week. That's months and months and months. I live, as I said, on Clinton. When 9-A has an accident, let's have all the traffic that backs up on Clinton on top of that.

The whole home ownership makes absolutely no sense to us. I lived in New York for 16 years. I got to tell you something. If I hit the lottery and I lived in a rent-stabilized apartment I'm not leaving, right? I think that's a ridiculous notion. Also, how do they judge who they can rent the apartment from them, and who says they're qualified to determine the person that can rent the apartment? That just seem very specious to me.

I am concerned also about the green and open space. There was someone at the house who talked about there are so many trees that would have to come down, and there are trees all in the front here for this driveway that have to get taken down. These are majestic old trees. To me, that is just such a terrible thing to remove all that greenspace that's there. I know there's a steep slope code. And the quote, I think, in the code is that they're environmentally sensitive areas and a valued natural resource. I also heard we'll meet some of the zoning, not all of the zoning. So they're going to have to ask for something to be able to do this, which will rip up the natural terrain and the vegetative features. There's going to be costs with the land.

All this rock, how is the rock going to come out where they have to rip up the driveway? There's a huge rock where that driveway is, from those pictures. You can see it in that bottom left corner. How is that going to get out of the ground? Are you going to have to dynamite, are you going to have to ... how are you going to break it up, with jackhammers? What kind of noise issues are going to happen in the neighborhood? I live there, I have two

small children. In fact, our entire block is full of small children.

Really, at the end of the day... also one other thing is what about public utilities? Will things have to get turned off? Will that impact my access? Will I be compensated for that if I lose access to my utilities? Really, the fundamental thing that I'm really upset about also is, at the meeting so many of us voiced our concerns and said we wanted more transparency. And then days later, the Affordable Housing Committee had a meeting and didn't let people know about it. That just shows that there is an alternative agenda to drive this stuff through very, very quickly. That, to me, again is just very specious. It's not about partnership. It doesn't feel like they have to answer to the community, the people that live around there.

I really think a bipartisan with the community should be established and all this information should be published. They have a Web site. Publish it. Put out the traffic study, put out the zoning requirements, put out all the things people are asking for. Hold them accountable. That's what this is about as part of a community. Not secret and only giving bits and pieces of information.

Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: Anybody else wish to speak?

Geraldine Ferrara, 68 Ravensdale Road: Hi, thank you for the opportunity. I live right across Ravensdale Road from this property. I don't have a problem with affordable housing being there. I do have a problem with the plan. I don't understand how you could build a driveway on a slope. Because on the front of plot A, or building A, there is a huge ... it's a pretty significant slope. I don't understand how you could build a driveway there. It's going to look incredibly ugly if you do do it. The trees that are there now are beautiful. Very selfishly, I like all the vegetation that's there because it absorbs some of the water that otherwise floats down into my basement. I'm very, very concerned about that.

I don't have small children, but my next door neighbor does and his overwhelming biggest concern is all the traffic. That is not a safe street to cross anywhere along there, frankly. Even at the corner, for all the reasons the gentleman before me cited, there's no way to stop people. The stop sign on the other side of the street is basically just a suggestion that most people don't take. They just roll right through it. It's a problematic area. If you throw up a whole lot of trees in front of that driveway and plant a lot of plants that may address the water and it would be fine. But the traffic, I think, is going to be a little trickier. And the parking is certainly an issue.

So thank you.

Tim Baer, 18 Kent Avenue: I'm five, six doors up. I'll just cut to the, well, lack of political correctness I guess. I look at this and I just think aesthetically it looks like a compound. It doesn't look like it's in keeping with the small single-family homes up the street and around it in terms of the amount of sort of parking space relative to the living space. That's just my gut. I think as a planning board, looking at this not with white space around it but in the context of all the other homes, how does that ... like just what does it look from an aesthetics of the neighborhood. So that's one.

The other point I would just say is, I wonder about the price of the house that's just stuck for three years. It's the wrong price, to me. I buy and sell for a living. Like if the price don't stay you get somebody in that wants it that's going to do something market rate, is going to make a single-family house and use the full property to its fullest extent.

I guess I'm all for affordable housing. I think it sort of makes sense in the context of the units that are built, sort of purpose-built, OK? I think carving up something that's not in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood to try to meet a name ... I also question the openness with which it's been brought to the community. But that's probably well-trod at this point. So those are my thoughts. Hopefully it resonates a little bit with the Board.

Tom Kadala, 25 Branford Road: Good evening. I'm the one who issued the survey so I thought I'd make sure I provided some of the results so everybody's aware of it. But before I do, I just wanted to mention there's an article in the *Rivertown Patch*, and it's titled "Another Affordable Housing Victory for Westchester. A judge ruled that the country should no longer be held in contempt." So apparently, the affordable housing issue is ... and that's, as you can see, the photograph here.

[Village Attorney Whitehead or Ms. Smith]: I know the article.

Mr. Kadala: OK. I'm just saying, if they ...

[Village Attorney Whitehead or Ms. Smith]: You have to read the whole article, not just ...

Mr. Kadala: Well, no. I mean, at the very end it basically says things like for 2015 the county has already surpassed its 600 units – that's the number – benchmark for financing. It was 635, and has 466 units with building permits, 59 ... so they basically have exceeded the goal.

Boardmember Alligood: Could you just make your point clear? Are you saying that

Hastings has enough affordable housing? Can you explain what your point is?

Mr. Kadala: The point is the transparency issue.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's different quotes from the county. That's something out of a newspaper.

Mr. Kadala: OK, can I finish, ma'am?

Village Attorney Whitehead: [cross-talk].

Mr. Kadala: I understand. All I'm getting at is the misinformation that was cited earlier of meetings happening that aren't being announced and things happening behind the scenes, and not this openness that we're asking for.

I'm going to move to the next point, which is the survey results just so people are aware of those. This is basically the community speaking, so you can either listen to them or not listen to them. That's your prerogative. One-third of them were in favor and two-thirds were either not in favor or undecided. So I think our work is cut out for us. Of those who were undecided and not in favor, the number one priority for them was safety and the second priority was transparency.

Building Inspector Minozzi: [off-mic].

Mr. Kadala: The safety issue has been cited already: it's probably one of the most dangerous intersections in all of Hastings, no question about it. The sidewalk isn't wide enough – I don't need to go on further. You just drive down there and you'll see what I'm referring to.

The second issue is transparency, which is a big problem. Right now, we have a conflict of interest with Mr. Riolo. We were at the meeting and questioning Sue Smith. We asked if Mr. Riolo was getting a commission for the sale. She was saying no, he was not getting a commission. But we had to really drill down hard to her to finally get her to admit that yes, he is getting a commission, the firm is getting a commission. So the check says "Riolo" on it. The problem we have with all this is that Riolo – Mr. Riolo, who's here – is on the board of the affordable housing and, at the same time, he's the realtor who's representing the sale. Maybe that's why the sale price has never gone down, and that might be an explanation.

I'm just saying there's just a lot of this hanky-panky going on and we'd just like to have ... you know, we're all adults, we're all professionals who were called to a meeting one-half

hour before the vote was going to be taking place with the Board. Do we need to act this way? This is like kids. I think we need to treat each other properly, and then I think we'll get some better results. Those are issues. Again, this is the neighborhood speaking, this is what they said. Take it as what it's worth. And we'll do the same survey again in a couple months, see how we're doing. And hopefully we'll get some good results.

Oh, one point here, just a final point. The affordable housing is not the concern here, as has been mentioned already. That's not the issue. The issue is safety and transparency. So put yourself in our shoes. We know that intersection very well because we cross it every day, OK? and we see those rolling stops all day long.

The other issue is when somebody's trying to pull a fast one on you. I was not born yesterday, I didn't roll off the melon truck. I understand what's going on here. We all speak, we all see. So I think we don't need to do that. Let's be transparent. I think that would make a lot of sense. I think we'd feel better about ourselves with the decisions we make if we follow protocol that's based on integrity and, at the same time, transparency.

So that's all I have to say.

Boardmember Bass: I have a question.

Mr. Kadala: Thanks, sure.

Boardmember Bass: I drive that street all the time. It's a pretty funky intersection. If a traffic light was put in there, would that satisfy your safety concerns?

Mr. Kadala: You know, that's a very good question. It could, I don't know. That's something I'd like to put to the neighborhood. Me, personally, I think it would help tremendously. The problem I think you're going to have is, someone's going to say, you know, those people coming up the hill are going to suddenly see this traffic light and that could cause a problem."

Building Inspector Minozzi: (Inaudible) traffic going up the hill.

Male Voice: [off-mic].

Mr. Kadala: That might create another problem, I'm not sure.

Male Voice: [off-mic] come around this line ...

Mr. Kadala: Right, you'll see it. I'm not sure but, yeah, that kind of ... I don't know what other ... maybe a traffic expert could be asked to look at this more carefully. So thanks. Any other ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: I do think there's a reason why there's no stop sign coming up the hill. It's the only way you cannot stop.

Mr. Kadala: Exactly for that reason, right. So we kind of invite the problem already from the way it is. Because you also have the person that doesn't know that. They think it's a four-way stop sign, and they see you coming up the hill and you're going to take that left-hand turn. You swing across – and they're doing their rolling stop – and suddenly you have that little hesitation. It's the game of ... you know, listen, I live here, OK, I know where the stop signs are, you may not.

So there's a lot of that. I mean, it's not a very well planned intersection, and maybe we need to start there and think through if this makes sense. But think about it from the four families you want to invite to this property. If you're going to invite them and not have solved this safety problem I don't think I'd sleep well at night. It just isn't the right thing to do. So I think we need to think through some of the issues.

Boardmember Bass: Whose jurisdiction is Ravensdale?

Building Inspector Minozzi: It's ours.

Boardmember Bass: And in all the traffic studies that have been conducted over the last 10, 15 years what was the conclusion on addressing that intersection?

Building Inspector Minozzi: That, I couldn't answer. But I know from speaking with Chief Visalli that the criteria for stop signs and traffic lights within certain distances to curbs and other intersections is what prohibits anything more than what is there right now. But we could ask Chief Visalli for that information.

Boardmember Bass: OK, thank you.

Mr. Kadala: Great, thank you.

Mr. Casella: I'm on the board of the affordable housing. In terms of transparency, this is a proposal, this is a public discussion. Nothing has been decided or determined yet. We're all talking about it, you're all here, we want to hear what you have to say. No one's hiding anything. And in terms of affordable housing, my cousin grew up on the corner of Stanley

and Ravensdale. He worked for the Village for over 30 years, he served on the fire department for over 30 years, and he couldn't afford to buy a house in Hastings. So the whole idea is finding places for people who serve the community and who serve other communities who are good working people that we want to be a part of our community.

This might not be the right place, but it is a discussion and it is an open discussion. No one is hiding anything. Arthur's not hiding anything. I'm a builder, I don't build any of these things. I just consult, I try to help. That's all it's about. We don't get paid anything.

Ken Perry, 68 Ravensdale Road: I live right across the street. It seems that most things have already been said, but the reason I stepped up here is a comment that nobody is getting paid. The broker is going to get a sizeable commission. I think at the discussion at the house the figure was upwards of \$30,000. That's a lot of money, and he shouldn't be involved in any part of this process. It's not that everybody is a volunteer. There are people involved, obviously – the Riolos – that have a financial stake in this and I'm concerned about the extent to which that is tainting the process.

As far as the plans themselves, that proposed driveway – from my front yard, looking at that – it's just darn ugly. I actually like the idea of affordable housing. I went into that meeting at the house in favor of it and came out against it. The more I learned about the project the more problems I saw.

Thank you.

David Honor, 12 South Clinton: Hi, I'm right around the corner from there. First of all, I think what you're trying to do, in general, is wonderful. Affordable housing, I think, is a great thing and that your volunteering I think is wonderful. So thank you for that.

In terms of affordable housing at this location, very challenging. As you said before, Mr. Cameron, people tear ass ... they tear ass up the street. There's a speed sign that says 25 miles an hour. If we stood there with a radar gun all day long, nobody goes 25 miles an hour on this road, ever. It's very hard to go 25 miles an hour. I did go to a meeting with Greenburgh when they were trying to get, I think it's called, the Goddard School opened up and did raise the same concerns. It's about safety. I have two children and I have a special needs child. He's my younger son. The sidewalk in front of this house is very narrow and there's no sidewalk on the other side of Ravensdale. Let me ask this question. Does the house has to be built to do this project?

Ms. Smith: Yes.

Mr. Honor: It does. The driveway that they propose is a single-lane driveway. So if there are cars coming and coming out, someone's going to have to back up which I think presents a problem and causes a danger if people are backing up onto Kent. I know some people that live on Clinton have water issues. For me, it's all about safety over here. The water doesn't necessarily affect me, but if it affects my neighbors it affects me because they are my neighbors. I think, as a community, we all need to support each other if there's an issue that concerns them.

If there's another way to do this house, then I'm not immovable on this project. Just the way it is – with the driveway, like this gentleman said – it does sort of look like a compound the way it is drawn up. The driveway, also, I don't know if it's 30 feet from the corner. To make a left out of that driveway and then to make another left – or the right would be easier, but to make another left – would be challenging. Also, during this whole time when it snows, for example, that sidewalk has not been shoveled. I've fallen on there with my son, so I don't know who's responsible for that now but it ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: The homeowner.

Mr. Honor: The homeowner, who hasn't been there I guess for several years.

Building Inspector Minozzi: That is the answer to your question.

Mr. Honor: So there are a lot of concerns. If this plan can be redrawn or maybe scaled down somewhat, I don't ... from what you're saying, I don't think it can be. Is that correct? It's a very, very tough location. Again, it's a good idea to have affordable housing. I haven't met anyone in the town that's opposed to it. This location, on this specific corner, it's very challenging. You're saying you're adding eight, nine cars. There's got to be a problem sooner or later, there just is. I had asked the Planning Board if, when they do these plans, can they talk to the safety – is it safety commission? They work hand-in-hand. In order to build a project like this I feel like you sort of should have the answers prior in terms of stop signs and street lights.

Another thing that was raised already is the construction. If this does go through and they build a driveway, where are all these trucks going to park? They're going to have to park right on Ravensdale. The landscapers already park on the sidewalk, on Ravensdale.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Trucks can't park on Ravensdale. That's a no-parking zone.

Mr. Honor: I'm just saying landscapers do it all the time.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Call the police.

Mr. Honor: Yeah. I mean, the homeowner shouldn't also let ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: [Off-mic].

Mr. Honor: Good, I will do that in the future because it creates a dangerous situation. For me, again, this specific location is challenging. If something can be redrawn, or the driveway made not to look like it is, please, no matter what's done, the safety issues – on this corner, on this whole Ravensdale in general but specifically this corner – need to be addressed. Because if not, we're all liable if we let this pass. All of us are liable if something happens to anybody.

Thank you.

Adam Trese, 11 Clinton Avenue: First, I want to say the Affordable Housing Committee ... I'm a fan of the Affordable Housing Committee. The condos they did on Washington I think are great. They're in keeping with the rest of the buildings on the street. I'm a real estate agent, as well, and I work in Manhattan. You don't see that when people develop. They just do these crazy things that have nothing to do with the rest of the context of the block. I commend them for doing that.

I live on 11 Clinton and I just want to give a shout out to the steep slope. What you don't see on this plan are many ... and you did see it in the pictures, there are ... it's like the woods back there. Twenty-six Kent wraps around this property and it has ... 16 feet behind the eastern area between 9 Clinton and 69 Ravensdale there's this strip. Then over here on the left, that white space is 20 Kent. That's somebody's house, it's a really small lot. The thing about affordable housing, when you do affordable housing you don't want to have a poor door, you don't want to have an apartment that is different than everybody's else's for the people who in the affordable housing. You want everyone to be equal, you know? When they did the Ginsburg project on Saw Mill River Road, my understanding is that he wanted to put all the affordable housing units in one spot. Then the Village made sure – whoever did it – made sure that they were spread equally, because it's equal. This house will be very different.

Boardmember Bass: No, you're incorrect.

Boardmember Alligood: We couldn't finance it that way.

Mr. Trese: It didn't happen?

Boardmember Bass: Go to your next point.

Boardmember Alligood: We tried.

Mr. Trese: You tried.

Boardmember Sullivan: What happened was, they had to be separate, those people said, for financing. What happened is that they wanted the building to be off on the side. The Village now has the affordable housing building smack in the middle, with two market rate buildings flanking it. So we tried.

Mr. Trese: Oh, all right. Well, I didn't know that. Sorry.

Chairman Cameron: We got everybody in the same neighborhood.

Mr. Trese: Well, anyway I thought that's what had happened.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: We did raise the concerns.

Boardmember Bass: But next point.

Mr. Trese: To my point, this house will be very different. Regardless of all that and all the things people have said about safety, when I look out my windows there are so many animals that live in this area, there's so much wildlife. When you read the Village code about the steep slopes and it talks about – you know, there's some really excellent language how it's written about the visual ... I think it's the visual landscape. I mean, this is sort of the entrance of the Village from the bridge. When you're driving there it's just trees, it's just tons and tons of trees. Those trees, you know, they're all going to get ... a lot of them are going to get torn down, and I really think that's going to be a shame. Because instead of looking at the woods, now I'm going to be looking at probably the part of that house. So be it. I look at houses on every other side of my property.

I think that tearing down trees ... and I don't know if this is true. I believe that somebody tried to buy this and do a development and brought it to the Planning Board, but it was not approved because of the steep slope. I don't know if that's true or just a rumor I heard. But I really hope that the steep slopes ... and his point about the article that he quoted – he was quoting – that I also say the reason why that was brought up is because when the grant was brought to the Board of Trustees. Ms. Smith was saying that they only had 'til Friday to file their application and there was this urgency. And also, we have this urgency with this

number of units. So now it seems like there's been a lot of progress so people are kind of backing down from that urgency. Not that I'm saying there isn't urgency.

This is kind of like putting a square peg through a round hole. I know I've spoken to her about this and mentioned it, too. The foreign legion building, I don't understand why that can't be invested ... that's like a huge property, and why can't the Village make them a deal somehow to relocate them and then you can really put a whole bunch of affordable housing units on that Farragut property at 215 Farragut or whatever it is. You know, that would be a great solution. I just think this is not an ideal solution. It's going to mess up other people's property, the views, and their quality of life. I mean, I grew up on Manhattan and I couldn't care less about affordable housing. I think it's a great idea, I just don't think this is the place for it.

Thank you.

Tom Kadala: I just wanted to clarify one point.

Boardmember Bass: Just have someone else speak. You have other people waiting.

Chairman Cameron: If someone else wants to speak you can't go up for a second until everyone else has spoken one time. It's one of our laws.

Mark Samath, 48 Fenwick Road: I'll be quick. I don't know which is worse, Ravensdale or Mt. Hope, in terms of traffic. One of our kids was almost hit crossing both of those streets. We've been drilling them since they were really young, and we have friends who have a kid who was almost hit on Ravensdale. The cars, as you've heard, go extremely fast.

Here's my one point. I'm also in favor ... a proponent of affordable housing. And thank you and everyone who's involved in bringing more affordable housing specifically to Hastings, whatever the limit is and whether it's been reached or hasn't been reached. We can't do enough on that score, and I thank all of you guys who are involved in that. Here's my concern, and it's safety. That corner is a nightmare. As far as I understand – because I've had conversations with the safety commission on these issues – but you guys would check it yourself, as I understand it you have a stop sign here.

Building Inspector Minozzi: That's correct.

Mr. Samath: Somebody said "suggestion." The problem is coming up here and then they don't stop. It would be great if we could have a stop sign here, but you can't because there's not enough ... it's been explained to me, when I said why don't you put a stop sign here or a

stop, you can't do it. You have to keep the traffic moving up Ravensdale because people are speeding up and they don't see ... they will never see the stop sign. Here's your problem. You increase traffic on this corner, you get a bunch-up. You get somebody coming up Ravensdale, somebody's going to get killed. Someone is going to get killed. It's not workable from a safety point of view.

Chairman Cameron: Yes, please, in the back row.

Mindy Farkas, 14 Kent Avenue: We also are up a block and didn't hear anything about this until we had talked to one of our local firemen that somehow this was happening. I'm just going to say ditto. We all, who've lived there for 20-some years and have kids almost killed every time they try and cross that road, and the lack of good sidewalks, and myself walking down Ravensdale to try and get to my house, this is a not a good corner. I love affordable housing, I believe in it. I just had a little side talk with Ira about, you know, it's really only four units but it could be nine more cars. It's coming out in my street, it's coming onto Kent. I can't get out of street in the mornings. This morning I counted over 20 cars before I could get out of my street. I just think it's not a safe place to put a lot more people.

Boardmember Bass: I actually have some questions for the architect. In terms of your selection of the site plan, since you have a project on Washington and Warburton, did you consider attaching the units? Or you didn't have the separation and you had more of a row house?

Ms. Griffin: This is a single-family district, R-10 district.

Boardmember Bass: Understand that. But, you know, I come from a background where you define what you want and then you make the rules fit it. So if we need relief from the regulations to make a better site plan ...

Ms. Griffin: Hopefully, it's more [creative about it] [off-mic] but I think you're assuming that we might [off-mic] zoning [off-mic].

Boardmember Bass: So currently, this site plan ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: The mic's not on.

Boardmember Bass: So currently, this site plan wouldn't need relief from the zoning regulations?

Ms. Griffin: It might need relief because of the width of the driveways, the total width of

the driveways. But your idea of attached or townhouses or cluster housing perhaps, I don't know how that would work. Because this is an R-10, single-family zone. It doesn't fit the description of that zone.

Boardmember Bass: Right. But you know the site, and if you were to design a good site plan ...

Ms. Griffin: I would definitely do cluster housing. I would not do separate ... if I had this whole property I would probably look at either semi-detached or a different layout perhaps. But, you know, we're also trying to make use of the existing house that's here.

Boardmember Bass: I understand that. The family that lived in the house before, people have described it as a large family. How many people lived there?

Ms. Griffin: Lived there? I don't know.

Male Voice: Twelve.

Boardmember Bass: And how many cars did they have?

Female Voice: A lot.

Male Voice: A microbus.

Female Voice: That was before Stew Leonard's and [off-mic] 9-A.

Boardmember Bass: But again, I hear everyone's concerns but I'm trying to have an apples-to-apples comparison. So if it's a large ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I'm sorry, how many bedrooms are in the house right now? You said six?

Ms. Griffin: Six.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And this structure that is existing, the proposal is when you divide it into the two units what are the bedroom breakdowns, Christina?

Ms. Griffin: Four and two.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: So the same, and then there's a second structure.

Ms. Griffin: It's very easily divided because the other two bedrooms are accessible to a lower area that's a large open space with a kitchen. So it's very easy. It's already set up as if there are two different residential units.

Building Inspector Minozzi: [Off-mic] two houses next to each other.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I'm just trying to gauge sort of what the increase is. Let's say you sold that house tomorrow on the market – it's a six-bedroom house.

Male Voice: It's important what was just said [off-mic].

Boardmember Alligood: You're going to have to come up to the mic if you're going to talk.

Building Inspector Minozzi: For the audience to talk you have to come up to the microphone. This is a recorded and video'd session that's being transcribed for the minutes. Everything you're saying is being recorded and transcribed so you have to speak into the microphone.

Boardmember Bass: And you get to watch yourself all week.

Ms. Ferrara: For the last 12 years that we've been there, when the house wasn't vacant there were only three adults there at any one time. I think they had two kids, and that was an old woman and her daughter. The daughter's husband moved in to take care of her. Once she died, it became vacant. That was 12 years. I didn't live here before Stew Leonard's was built, but my guess is when that family of 12 was there it was a single mother and all her children. It was the Bennett family. When there were 12 people there, I feel fairly confident that they were children. So the car and the traffic issue wasn't the same for them at that point.

Boardmember Bass: Regardless of whether this goes through or not, that's a funky intersection. It may be really interesting to look at other options that haven't been considered. I'd be more than happy to work with the police department and the safety committee to come up with some alternatives. There's a solution here that just hasn't been addressed.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Well, when it comes to the Planning Board officially we could always request a traffic study, like we just did with Ned Baldwin.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You could retain a traffic consultant. He could look into that

as part of your review of the application. Right now, it's just an informal [unintelligible].

Building Inspector Minozzi: This is completely informal. A lot of things have been discussed tonight a little bit above and beyond what we're supposed to be doing with this tonight.

Boardmember Bass: But we're all here.

Building Inspector Minozzi: With that said.

Ms. Smith: Just one comment. When we've been talking with the neighbors, there's been a lot of frustration over the years having gone to the Safety Council to try to get some remedies there. It's obviously a problem that's existed for some time and it needs some bigger, more intensive look at it, clearly, just to resolve it aside from the affordable housing. But there is a frustration level that somehow they have not been heard about it. I think I'm explaining that first responder. If there was some way to work with whatever the parties are that could make something happen there it would be, obviously ... there are lots of places in Hastings that don't have good traffic situations, but this is certainly a prime one.

Boardmember Bass: No, we all have our favorite intersections. That's one or two of mine.

Chairman Cameron: OK. Sorry.

Boardmember Bass: One more.

Robin Joseph, 9 Clinton Avenue: I live just to the right of that green line. I'd like to echo the safety concerns, but I would also like to talk with you a little bit about the water runoff. In the 22 years that I've been living at 9 Clinton, the topography of that whole area has changed pretty radically. Another shout out to the steep slope; it's gotten steeper, my property has gotten steeper, and the water runoff is pretty bad. I think with any building you do there I would just love to make sure that that's addressed. I know you talked about some sort of system – which I didn't quite get what that was – and I think that's a pretty big issue for me personally and, I think, also for people who are downslope of that area.

Thank you.

Boardmember Bass: Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: OK, well, thank you very much for coming. I mean, nothing's going to happen for awhile. We're going to think, obviously, about what you said. I don't know

when they're going to ask to move forward on this thing, but we will be thinking about it, studying it, and trying to come up with ideas ourselves in the meantime. And we're always on TV. You can go back and watch us. We're very open.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Very transparent.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Could you please take your conversations outside. The meeting's not over.

2. Proposed Local Law E of 2015 – Gateway Cluster Overlay District

Chairman Cameron: Our next agenda item concerns a proposed law that was referred to us by the Board of Trustees. It's the gateway cluster overlay district, and they would like our comments and recommendations on this proposed law. I think what we can do is discuss it this evening and then one or more of us can write up a short report and circulate it to the members of the group. Then that way we can get it back to the Board of Trustees. They seem like they want to go fairly quickly.

Linda can tell us more, but they have this on the 10th of December up before the ZBA I believe, don't they? Is that right, Linda?

Village Attorney Whitehead: It was referred to them also, and that's their next meeting.

Chairman Cameron: We know they can't, or won't, do anything 'til the 10th of December, but we need to get our report pretty fast.

Boardmember Bass: Can I ask why the urgency? This was discussed in the Comp Plan several years ago. Why now, and why the urgency?

Village Attorney Whitehead: There were some members of the Board of Trustees who, not for any particular reason, were just concerned that some of these gateway properties may be up for development. They wanted to make sure to have something in place before that might happen. There's nothing that anybody knows of that's actually happening. I'm just passing along the sense of urgency I was given from certain people. There's nothing specific.

These are just – so everybody understands it – all the different Andrus properties: it's Graham School; it's the church.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Jamie and I did it today.

Chairman Cameron: This is the Andrus Home down here [off-mic].

Village Attorney Whitehead: Wait, why don't you people ask me? I have it. Nobody asks me. I didn't make copies.

Chairman Cameron: I won't bother doing this one. This is a small piece of land [off-mic].

Village Attorney Whitehead: You want me to lend you this?

Building Inspector Minozzi: I have it.

Chairman Cameron: [Off-mic].

Village Attorney Whitehead: This is my only ... this is the Andrus Children's Home, this is the Graham School, this is the church, and then these are all the other various Andrus properties.

Boardmember Sullivan: And what's (inaudible)?

Village Attorney Whitehead: I'm sorry, what?

Boardmember Sullivan: What's the (inaudible)?

Boardmember Bass: Why I'm asking is, in a vacuum ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: I understand the question.

Boardmember Bass: Because on the other side we have Reynolds Field, which ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Is under construction?

Boardmember Bass: Which is under construction, that's zoned single-family, that had a site plan that went through a whole public review. The destruction of the trees violates the site plan. That's my ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right now, it's school district-owned and the Village has no authority.

Boardmember Bass: I fully understand that. But using that same argument, if the Board of

Ed decided they needed to sell or joint venture that land so they could continue their mission that argument wears thin.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right. I can tell you that on the Board of Trustees' list – and they were kind of trying to prioritize things – is another recommendation of the Comp Plan. It's to take those areas, which is very different – this is a gateway, that's not a gateway, that's (inaudible) – and rezone it. It was a recommendation of the Comp Plan and it is on their list to be done. But with all the money the school district's about to invest in Reynolds Field I don't think they felt it was likely to get sold or developed any time soon.

Boardmember Bass: Right, but we're a body that reviews site plans. Here's the largest elephant in the room that had a site plan that they violated. Either they're disingenuous or they're dishonest.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I have no idea whether (inaudible) violated, and that site plan didn't have approval from ... the Village doesn't approve that plan.

Boardmember Bass: I understand that. But as we're talking about land use in the Village – saying we're not going to look at that project ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, they are looking at it. You can't look at the project and say it's absolutely ... but the property, and the zoning of the property, is on their radar. They just didn't feel it was as much of a priority.

Boardmember Bass: Well, see, I disagree. I think we should ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: They weren't going to do everything at once.

Boardmember Bass: I think we should.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I think she's just saying the school district is investing all this money in this project right now, so it's unlikely that they'll form a public-private partnership or sell it to a developer in the immediate future. It's out like six months.

Boardmember Bass: I understand that, but I don't like being lied to and this ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Who do you feel like you were lied to by?

Boardmember Bass: The Board of Ed. The site plan and the EIS that they put out said X, and what they're building is not what they said in that site plan review.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: How long ago did you do a site plan review of that?

Boardmember Bass: When they ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: When the bond act went through?

Boardmember Bass: Yeah, when they presented the impact analysis. I look at it. So nobody in the Village – the Planning Board, the Trustees – looked at that site plan, and I think that's a travesty.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, the Village ... I understand your point. I'm just telling you – as I think you all know – the Village can't do anything about it. The Village has no jurisdiction over the school district.

Building Inspector Minozzi: This board has absolutely no jurisdiction over it whatsoever.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The Board of Trustees ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: We understand your thought. It's a moot point.

Chairman Cameron: Well, then I guess to give you another one, the Board of Trustees built the Community Center and never came to the Planning Board.

Boardmember Bass: I think *that's* wrong, and I would urge the Planning Board ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: You know, a Tuesday night agenda.

Boardmember Bass: And I would urge ...

Chairman Cameron: I wasn't on the Planning Board then so I'm not personally offended. I was just ...

Boardmember Bass: It's wrong. We're a small little village, and here's a major site plan that's going through. They made certain public statements, and no one is reviewing it? We're trusting the Board of Ed that they know best?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, the state should be ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: Richard, just to make you feel even better. Reynolds Field used

to be Village property and they gave it to the Board of Ed ...

Boardmember Bass: Right, I read the deed.

Boardmember Ambrozek: ... and never put any constraints on what could be done or how it could be done.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'd like to bring it back to what we're ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yeah, sorry.

Village Attorney Whitehead: [Off-mic].

Chairman Cameron: Reel it back in? Given that I have to get up in 6-1/2 hours and go to another meeting.

Boardmember Sullivan: I appreciate the Trustees taking this on and I understand their sense of urgency, but I think we need to do it right. The things I saw – and it was sort of in my e-mail – the Comp Plan had two ideas: one was a simple gateway buffer, in a sense, which would be looking at areas that had green value to the Village, Warburton, Washington, Farragut. You know, we can come up with that list and come up with some kind of buffer where, with the net buffer, you had to talk to somebody before you cut down the tree. I'm thinking, for myself, Farragut Parkway – as you're driving through the Saw Mill – the right-hand side ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's state property.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, the state has to coordinate with us to some degree. My point is, there's a piece of property that cut down three gigantic trees. Maybe they were diseased, maybe they were a danger, but they were beautiful. OK, that's one component. The other component was looking at creating cluster zoning opportunities where, as I understand it, you have a site with some natural resource that you're trying to protect. And people ... instead of subdividing the property – we've seen a few examples this evening – let's consider the natural resources, give use of benefits, allow you to put the buildings closer together and it's a win for everybody. There's a view, there's wetlands, whatever. What we don't have, I think, yet – and the Comp Plan got into that – is an understanding of where those things are and how they're defined.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Can I make a suggestion, given that it's 11:30 at night and it sounds like this discussion is ... people really have some things to say. Maybe what you

should do is, for now, send a memo back to the Board of Trustees saying we need more time. Then I can give you more information on the background, how we got to where we are.

Boardmember Sullivan: That'd be awesome.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Because I think for us to try to discuss this at this hour, it's not going to be a fruitful discussion.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I'll agree with that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: They're probably going to get mad at me for suggesting this.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Well, they didn't see what time it was when you suggested it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But I think, Jamie, if you could just send something that says we have a very long agenda, this is a big topic, you know, there are people who are on the Comp Plan committee and work off these recommendations. We need to be able to have a better discussion, and I can give you more background. But I think you just need to tell them that. Not just we didn't do it, we don't have anything to say, but we need more time.

Chairman Cameron: We have something to say, right?

Village Attorney Whitehead: But I think you're going to have to commit to getting to it at the December meeting.

Chairman Cameron: Right.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Boardmember Sullivan: As long as we don't have all the excitement like we had today.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I don't think the Ravensdale property will be back with a real application by then.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting Date – December 17, 2015

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Boardmember Ambrozek: Before we do that, I would like to say that I am very concerned about having all the materials for this meeting given to me only electronically. I'd like to request that in the future we revert to having it on paper, as we did before.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I know Eva has already told Buddy she wants paper. If everybody could let Buddy know electronic's OK, you want paper, you want full-size paper, you want reduced paper. Then he can try to get everybody what they ...

Chairman Cameron: I would hope, for example, that we could just say to them all accessory apartments can be electronic

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes, a few pages. But even the SWPPP, I had ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: I give you credit for reading it.

On motion by Chairman Cameron, SECONDED by Boardmember Ambrozek with a voice vote of all in favor, the Regular Planning Board Meeting was adjourned.

Boardmember O'Reilly: And I thank Richard Bass for bringing the cookies.