

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

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

I. ROLL CALL

II. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

Chairman Cameron: So as we now have a quorum, we're going to now have the election of the chair of the Planning Board for the next year, which is our first item on the agenda of our first meeting. Anybody have any suggestions?

Boardmember Alligood: Oh, yes. I nominate you, Jamie.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Second.

Boardmember Sullivan: Third.

Chairman Cameron: All right, so we'll make this brief.

On MOTION of Boardmember Alligood, SECONDED by Boardmember Ambrozek with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to re-elect James Cameron to Planning Board Chairperson.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Congratulations.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you.

Boardmember Sullivan: Thank you for volunteering, and you've done a wonderful job.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of December 18, 2014

Chairman Cameron: First, I have to make sure that all four of us were at that meeting.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes, I was.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes.

Chairman Cameron: OK, good. That way, we have a quorum. We can check the first page, which Ellen will do, to make sure Eva was here.

Boardmember Alligood: Remind me. I can't keep track.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think you were here.

Boardmember Alligood: I think I was, too.

Deputy Village Clerk Ballantine: You're down for the meeting.

Chairman Cameron: OK, good. Anybody have any comments to the minutes? Do you have any comments to the minutes?

Boardmember Ambrozek: No comments.

Boardmember Sullivan: I read them and they were very accurate. There's a tendency to use some slang: "gonna" instead of "going to." And I don't know if that's because the person who's doing the transcription is being very literal.

Deputy Village Clerk Ballantine: What he hears is what he ...

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, I know. But I think he's hearing something he wants to hear. There were, 40 times, "gonna" in the last minutes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Really? How?

Chairman Cameron: In the last minutes I thought about it, but you've brought it up. There's about 30 in this one, and I don't speak that way. It's "going to." If you just go

through and replace it?

Deputy Village Clerk Ballantine: Yes, and he'll hear this now.

Village Attorney Whitehead: He'll know, in the future, to put "going to."

Chairman Cameron: Anybody else have a comment?

Boardmember Sullivan: Exactly. We use well grammar very well.

Chairman Cameron: On page seven, Mary Ellen, I have a lead-in paragraph describing what we're about to consider, and then I had the official announcement. And for some reason, in the lead-in paragraph I say something different than what I say in the resolution. And they should be exactly the same. Let me see if I can get there. This is not exactly material, but it's ... these minutes are too long with all this talking. Are you on page seven?

Deputy Village Clerk Ballantine: Yes.

Chairman Cameron: You see when I officially announce what we're saying, and then just before that I sort of say it again. The first time it should have a same wording as the second time 'cause I'm actually reading from the same piece of paper. So I don't know how it got to be different. Almost there, sorry. I'll give it to you after the meeting.

Deputy Village Clerk Ballantine: You're not talking about the motion, are you?

Chairman Cameron: Yes.

Deputy Village Clerk Ballantine: Oh, the motion.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, maybe that's page eight. But anyway, I'll get it to you after the meeting. It's just language to get right.

All right, so if no one else has comments, could I have a motion to approve the minutes?

On MOTION of Boardmember Ambrozek, SECONDED by Boardmember Sullivan with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of December 18, 2014 were approved as amended.

V. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Cameron: OK, now have we two public hearings tonight. Both of them are actually accessory apartments.

1. Accessory Apartment Permit Renewal – Application of Augusto Carrozzi – 31 Farragut Avenue – SBL: 4.80-62-5.

Buddy, can you give us a report?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes. There's been no changes to this accessory apartment. We haven't received any complaints. There's no waivers required for the apartment; it's 1.2 percent under the maximum amount permitted by code. So I recommend approval for the next three years.

Chairman Cameron: OK.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Mary Ellen, that's wrong on the agenda. It says "*waivers required*," so we should, just for the record, fix that. Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: So do we have anybody from the public who'd want to comment on this accessory renewal? Anybody from the Board wish to comment on it?

On MOTION of Boardmember Ambrozek, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application for renewal of the accessory apartment permit of Augusto Carrozzi at 31 Farragut, known as SBL: 4.80-62-5 on the Village tax maps, with no waivers required.

2. Accessory Apartment Permit Renewal – Application of Kyunghee Raad – 770 Broadway – SBL: 4.20-2-1. Waivers required for square footage and parking.

Chairman Cameron: Let's go the second hearing on an accessory apartment approval. This is the accessory apartment permit renewal application of Kyunghee Raad of 770 North Broadway, and is known as SBL: 4.20-2-1 on the Village tax maps.

Buddy, can you give us a report?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Sure. There's been no changes to this accessory apartment either. We have received no complaints. This is a large apartment. It's 49 percent of the existing dwelling, making it 24 percent over the allowable 25 percent required by code. And it has no legal off-street parking, so it's going to need a waiver for coverage and a waiver for parking.

Chairman Cameron: Has this one been before us before?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes, this is the same exact one as it was last time.

Chairman Cameron: I must have been away that day.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: There's been no changes to this apartment since last time.

Chairman Cameron: Any comments from the Board? It's nice-looking. I went by it, like the rest of you. Any comments from the audience?

On MOTION of Boardmember Ambrozek, SECONDED by Boardmember Sullivan with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application for the renewal of the accessory apartment permit of Kyunghye Raad of 770 North Broadway, and is known as SBL: 4.20-2.1 on the Village tax maps, with the waivers required for square footage and parking.

VI. NEW BUSINESS - None

VII. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

Site Plan Approval – Application of Yvonne and Raymond Sanchez for the addition and alterations to their multi-family dwelling at 46 High Street. Said property is located in the 2R Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.110-115-12 on the Village Tax Maps.

Chairman Cameron: Could I ask you to come and make your presentation, please?

Julius Twine, representing the applicant: Good evening. The owners are able to attend tonight, so they'll be able to respond in any way you would like.

I did not bring the small drawings, as we talked about before – I mean as I talked about with the Building Inspector. The last time I was before you, we looked at the site plan rather closely. There were several things that you had previously mentioned that we didn't include in that site plan and that we needed to have addressed. There were two schemes that we talked about. First was revision number one, which had the stair along the front of the building. Then there was a second scheme, which was more to the owners' liking and a slightly different way of approaching this. The stairs started out along the front, then changed and went along the side of the building and went partial way to the side yard, and then into there. We had the entrance to the second level along the eastern wall of the building. That turns out to be a more acceptable layout for the apartment, et cetera, and is one that the owners were more in favor of.

I have the layout of the property in the larger size that you can now probably see better. There were several things you had indicated that were not on the original plan that we had showed you. For instance, you had asked that we parcel out the parking area and put in parking lines so that the actual parking would be indicated. This we've done. We have indicated that we would put in three lines. Now, in dividing up the space there was also the additional problem that a curbcut for the parking was somewhat more than permitted. The first thing that was suggested was maybe routing out all the pavement that was there already, which gets to be quite a difficult task to do. I mean, it could be done, but to get the pavement out and all is rather difficult. We suggested maybe putting in some sort of obstructions in that area, which would then have parking limited to the area that previously had a curbcut. We were suggesting that we put some obstructions in that fourth space to render it impossible for anyone to park there. That's the parking part of it.

Additionally, you suggested that we have some sort of planting that would sort of dress up the front of this building. We are suggesting that we put in a modest-sized tree in the front yard in front of the porch area, which would soften that area up. Additionally, we suggested putting forsythia in a sort of medium tree. We suggested an American holly or similar kind of tree that would not grow too large but would give some cover. We suggested also that we put forsythia along the edge of the building, which gives it a little color. And on the northern corner of the building we've added a shrub area.

We have added – want to add, rather – an upper deck. There was some concern that the neighbor ... that that would sort of overlook the area. You have suggested we put a tree in this area, which we've located here. Now, at this stage I would bring up the fact that in discussing this particular tree with the owners they're not very pleased with that location, but have suggested that we might be committed to consider placing some trees in this 8-foot area that we have between the garage and the adjacent property. We don't show that, but we have

that as a desire of the owners. I'd just like to bring that up for you. The other thing we've done is to plant some vines along the area that would grow and sort of shade ... rather not shade, but be a blind that would protect the entry to this second level from the neighbors. I can show that to you in the second drawing.

This is the second-level plan. I've shaded this area because we're asking that we be given some additional space along the front, and only use an area that's on the north side as a passage to get to the entrance to the apartment. As I said, we were going to put some latticework along here to sort of shade that area off. What one does is to enter from the front, go up a portion of the stairs, make a turn, and then go up to the deck level, which is short of the eastern border – different from what we had before. We do have the problem that the Zoning Board was not at all pleased with our going all the way out to the edge. What we've done is to make it so that the stair itself remains within a valid setback area because one is permitted a certain amount of setback into the side yard at this upper level. However, we still have the problem that the roof of the porch, of the first-floor porch, a portion of that would be converted to an entry deck to get to this doorway. We still have to see if we can get the Zoning Board of Appeals to go along with that.

Then, as I say, we are planting vines along this border, this latticework, to further shade the area. Along the front, you will notice we have a wider stairway, a wider deck, which is to make up for the deck we don't have over there.

Elevation-wise from the James Street side, looking at the property, one gets the forsythia along the side of the building – the tree and the area that our stair begins. And the second tree is now, as shown here, located between the storage shed and the deck. We have another shrub here. This is the tree, by the way, that the owners would prefer – not this particular tree, but several smaller trees – to be on the border to block the view from that deck. Looking at that from the side, from the north elevation, this is the latticework that we're talking about to shield the entry, the stair going up that side, and the edge of the deck. Here's our tree out in front of that, and our forsythia along the building.

Those are the basic changes that we were talking about making. Except for the changes that the owners want to make to that, that's a preferable layout to the one where the stairs come along the front of the building.

Boardmember Bass: What caliper trees were you proposing, what height, what width?

Mr. Twine: I was proposing American holly along the front here.

Boardmember Bass: I understand the type. Are you suggesting 1 inch, 2 inches, 4 inches, 6 inches, 8 feet, 10 feet? You describe a tree, so a 1-inch caliper tree won't do anything for at least 20 years.

Mr. Twine: Right.

Boardmember Bass: If you're talking about a 6-inch caliper tree that's 8 or 10, 12 feet tall, that's a different story. What are you proposing?

Mr. Twine: We're proposing a medium-level one. We'd have to talk to a tree person to get a specific one.

Boardmember Bass: Shouldn't you have done this before this meeting? You want us to approve a site plan and we don't know what kind of tree. Shouldn't you have done that before this meeting?

Chairman Cameron: And you've drawn them as 15 to 20 feet tall.

Mr. Twine: I do, but I just show it as a tree that's mature.

Boardmember Bass: I could be a lot older when those trees mature.

Mr. Twine: I'm sorry?

Boardmember Bass: I could be a lot older when those trees mature.

Mr. Twine: Yes. Well, I would select an acceptable size tree. We didn't do that, but we could come up with one that would be an acceptable size. I remember the chairman saying do not come with just a tiny tree.

Chairman Cameron: But I agree with my colleague here that we need to actually, before we give you approval, choose a size of tree because we get some assurances that we're going to have some shelter once this thing is done. It would be a condition that you put in a tree to getting your certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Twine: Right. We could surely agree that we'd get a size that you would want. I didn't select a size on it. I would recommend to the owners that it be an acceptable one, but we would probably want to talk to someone who's going to provide the tree to give us some counsel on that. And it would be within limits that you would set.

Boardmember Bass: It makes me uncomfortable because we could set an 8-inch caliper tree as a condition of approval, and that will be it. We would make it part of the site plan approval that the trees must survive or the COO is forfeited. You have a pretty ugly building. We asked for a landscaping to mask that, and you come back with generalities about moderate-size trees. That's not acceptable for a site plan review.

Mr. Twine: OK.

Boardmember Bass: I mean, I could buy you a suit, and I'm going to buy you a moderately-sized suit. I need to know your size. You're asking this planning board to approve a site plan with landscaping as a requirement, and you have no specificity.

Mr. Twine: OK. I'd be willing to ... as I said, I would want to work with the Board to come up with a particular size that they would find acceptable. And I'd want to consult with the owners on that, too. You must say, I think it must also be considered that we're going quite a ways from what we were originally talking about with this project.

Boardmember Bass: I hear you, and I do site plan review for a living. I would never go to a hearing and not know what size tree I'm proposing.

Mr. Twine: OK.

Boardmember Bass: You're wasting our time.

Mr. Twine: Have you a particular size in mind?

Boardmember Bass: I'm going to say 8 inches.

Mr. Twine: OK. Suppose I came in with a tree that was 4 inches and you wanted an 8-inch tree. I would not have done much for my ...

Boardmember Bass: I'm saying 8 inches because I don't trust your site plan review. If you came in with a 4-inch tree with some facts behind it that made sense, then I would accept that. But you're coming in with generalities and you're saying you're going to work with the Board. Well, I'm pulling 8 inches off the top of my head.

Mr. Twine: OK.

Boardmember Bass: Now, are you satisfied with that answer? Your client's going to pay for an 8-inch tree? You have no idea whether that works or it doesn't work.

Mr. Twine: I have the clients here to address this.

Boardmember Bass: I yield the floor.

Mr. Twine: You know, it is that I am trying to provide a site plan layout. I'm not a person who is trying to provide a total site for this building. I am adding the kind of amenities that you've asked for as best we could. I think we've given an approach.

Chairman Cameron: We can't approve an approach unless we know, for example, how big the tree is. Because this thing, quite candidly – as I said at the last meeting – is an eyesore with the new stair going up.

Mr. Twine: Yes.

Chairman Cameron: And it needs to be shielded. Not 10 years from now, not 15 years from now, but very, very quickly. And your proposal just won't do it. So you need to come up with something which is a bit generous on the tree side so we actually get trees that work there and actually provide some shelter in order to let you have the stair on the outside.

And while we're at it, just so we don't miss this, you ever had to take out the asphalt? I don't want to have more than three spots filled in. I don't want to come by next year and find out those little pots have been lifted up and now we have cars parked there. So we want you to remove the asphalt except from the three designated strike areas.

Mr. Twine: OK, that is what I needed to find out.

Chairman Cameron: Because that's what's going to happen. That's what happens all the time. You approve it, and then a year later the things have been removed and there's a car there. So we'd like it taken out, and the curb extended to where the stripes start.

Boardmember Bass: And that spot could hold another tree.

Chairman Cameron: Yes, it could. Maybe the best thing to do is for us to take a break on your application. You go outside with your clients and talk about the trees, and we'll take a couple of other applicants, and then we'll take you back again. Does that work for you?

Mr. Twine: Well, my clients are here. They might want to speak to this.

Chairman Cameron: Well, OK. I was giving you a chance to confer with them.

Sorry it's so warm in here. You're going to have to give him the mic.

Raymond Sanchez, applicant: I'm kind of new at this.

Boardmember Bass: Take your time. I had to write it down.

Mr. Sanchez: Ladies and gentlemen of the Board, good evening. My name is Raymond Sanchez. I'm one of the owners of the property. After exploring several options regarding the placement of entrance, landscaping, cosmetics, curb appeal and functionality I came to state my opinions are open to yours.

Regarding the landscaping, I didn't get a chance to confer with him. I talked to my mother. She's the other owner. I agree with the Board, and feel that trees and bushes are appropriate for the property along the northern end.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: You have to speak into the microphone.

Chairman Cameron: He'll give you the microphone. And Julius can give you the microphone he has.

Mr. Sanchez: Thank you ... along the northern end over here between the shed and the neighbor's garage. I've been looking into arborvitae trees – regarding the Emerald Green arborvitae – which grows ... starts off we purchase about 10 to 15 feet, and it'll grow up to 25 feet, with a spread of 3 to 4 feet. Adding several of them over here will shield the view from the neighbors – as I have pictures over here if you would care to see them – how close the house is to the property and everything. And along the eastern side, along James Street, shrubs or hedges, if you will, approximately 5 to 6 feet tall if needed. I didn't get an exact type, but they also have arborvitae for those that also intermingle and make the hedge look ... so I was leaning away from the trees right in the middle of the yard because we have several families with children and the open areas get the children and their friends areas to play.

Sorry, I'm a little under the weather. But that's why we're leaning away from the big trees in the yards. But I have no problem putting large trees, minimum 10, 15 feet, in the front if need be, or the side, whichever the Board feels is appropriate. That was just the landscaping part.

Would the Board have any other questions maybe I could answer?

Oh, as far as the parking, I understand to cut it out, make it appropriate to the curb. Not a problem. Lines drawn on the ground, not a problem.

The staircase. On the previous diagram that we had seen before, the first time, in my opinion the entrance should be as far east on the northern part because of the staircase. The staircase is determined by a mathematical equation regarding the height and angle of the steps and the distance to the entrance. So basically, the more west the entrance the more west the staircase will, closer towards James Street. So along here, if we could bring it as far east as possible it would shorten the length of the staircase. In addition, adding the stairs on the north side will lessen the footprint and blend in to the lines of the house. So I contemplated turning the stairs to the west side of the house, only to see, in my opinion, that it looked like a motel. Which would be turning over on the northern end and going down the west end, which would be this picture over here. It kind of reminds me of a motel. I wasn't in favor for it, but if the Board sees it differently that's fine, I'll go with it. Kind of flexible.

I have other notes, but I don't know if they're relevant. So please feel free to ask any questions.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, my two concerns are that ... you know, we understand that the issue that you're trying to address is the access from the ground floor to the first-floor apartment; that you want to separate it from the existing use of the front door, or the door to the ground floor apartment. But what you're doing is, by putting in not just a staircase but also decking for the upper floor apartment, you're increasing the massing. And this is already a very overdeveloped property in terms of proportions. It's grandfathered, but what you're doing now is not. The fact that there's a roof on the deck below is one thing, but to convert that to a deck is increasing the massing because you've got the railings and so forth. So I'm concerned about that.

And then I'm also concerned about the impermeable surfaces. Now, you'll remove the four parking spaces, but you're proposing also putting in quite a large amount of concrete pads where the staircase ends on the ground. There's no measurements of how much they cover. They look fairly substantial as increased impermeable area.

So those are my two concerns. Oh, and also lastly, in regard to planting trees between the shed and your property line, I could see that that's what you would favor. But, unfortunately, that puts the trees extremely close to a building on your neighbor's property. And it's important to have circulation around a building. When you put a lot of trees close to a building you cut down on the air circulation. Firstly, branches can fall onto that building, causing damage. Certainly there's leaf-fall, and then it affects the ventilation around the building.

Mr. Sanchez: OK. Can I talk? OK, I could bring it closer towards the shed which, because of the 8-foot setback, it'll be approximately 7 feet where the trees would be. That should give us adequate ventilation for the neighbor's garage. As far as once we remove that fourth parking spot, if we were to go with the first drawing that we had done before then we wouldn't have to do all the extra cement work that you were saying. Which would be another reason why the first drawing, back in the day, would have been so much better so we don't have cement and paths leading all the way to this. I see your point, but the arborvitae I chose because it was more like an evergreen. As far as leaves falling down and stuff like that, it wouldn't have leaves but it would be more like a Christmas-y thing. I have pictures where the neighbor across the street has the same trees. That's what gave me the idea. So it would blend in with the neighborhood.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, I appreciate your comments and I think you've shown that, from your perspective, you're willing to work with us to sort of come to resolution. Removing that fourth parking spot's very important. I think it makes a safer environment for cars to come and go from the parking lot, even though there's parking needed because of the units that are here in this building. I think it's still a very valid thing.

I'm a bit more neutral on where the stair is in any of the three schemes that we've seen. I think you're trying to balance out things you heard from the Zoning Board and the sense you've gotten from us. I don't think you're going to please either board 100 percent, so just keep on trying as best you can. I think Mr. Twine's done a nice job of taking these options and trying to do the best in adding them to a building that has some challenges to begin with.

So what I heard was some interesting ideas about how to put landscape on this property that it would be very useful for us to see. And I think to Richard's point earlier, to get a sense of the size and the specifications so people are comfortable. But I think hearing from you, it's very reassuring that I think we can come to a good resolution of what you guys have accomplished, what you're trying to accomplish, which is getting another apartment online and available.

Mr. Sanchez: I just wanted to say a few things. We had purchased the property with the driveway as it was. I didn't know it was any kind of violation. But I just wanted to state some facts. That the parking along James Street, I'm not sure if you know, is kind of difficult. Several families with multiple people living in the same homes have at least two cars or more. My property's four families with at least one car. If anyone on James Street has guests, like Christmastime or birthdays or weddings, it makes parking even more difficult. Several cars park on the sidewalks, on top of the curbs, on a daily basis on James

Street and High Street. I'm sure you've driven by there many times and seen it, especially on High Street.

It's kind of hard. Apparently, some owners feel the need to put ramps on the curb area there to park their car up on the curbs and sidewalks because the parking is so hard. Two cars driving opposite directions will have a hard time passing each other if a car is parked on James Street. That was the only reason why it was a big issue. Not only do my tenants have a place to park, which would alleviate a little bit of congestion on James Street, but there would be no problems with nobody parking on the curbs or blocking sidewalks or anything like that.

Overall, I could see your point. It's just a bad design in general, the whole street; the whole house, for that matter. I guess once everything's said and done, I just hope everybody is happy.

Boardmember Bass: What is the shed used for?

Mr. Sanchez: A lawnmower, snowblower, tools. It's a four-family so you got to be ... when they have a problem you got to be on point. So for the most part, that's all tools.

Boardmember Bass: Where it says "wood fence" on the site plan, is that a structure all the way to the western property line? Where it describes ... this section right there, what is that?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Julius, you got to use the microphone please.

Mr. Twine: I'm sorry.

That's an independent fence that really ...

Boardmember Bass: There's a fence on the property line, but there's no structure next to the fence.

Mr. Twine: You mean in here.

Boardmember Bass: Yeah.

Mr. Twine: That's a retaining wall.

Boardmember Bass: Where you see "wood fence" written on your plan, is there a structure built where you have wood fence written on your site plan?

Mr. Sanchez: No, there would not be a ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: It says "wood fence on stone wall."

Boardmember Bass: I know, I know, I know. But where ... I'm trying to understand. Is there a structure in that space on the property?

Mr. Sanchez: No, there's no structure.

Mr. Twine: No. The only structure is the shed.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Mr. Sanchez: That fence was just put there so the children or anybody doesn't fall off the embankment into the neighbor's yard.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I'm glad to hear your comments on taking the asphalt out. It seems to me that you will actually have three places to park. And a number of those could actually take two cars. So if one person had two cars they could get them both in there. I know it's a tight area to park, and we're not being critical at all of having another apartment there because we need these kinds of apartments in town. So we're in favor of it.

And I like the idea of using an American holly because that's one of the relatively few trees we have that's absolutely deer-proof. You have to worry about deer in town because they come and eat arborvitae and things like that. So you might have a problem with them behind that shed, even though there is some kind of cedar trees that the deer won't eat. We have some in the property next to us. I think we do need to decide on how big this tree is going to be. And maybe we'll just help you decide here, or you can retire for a few minutes, then come back. But one of the two. The other choice is to wait another 30 days, which I'm not in favor of.

Like Kathy, I like the way you've redone the stairs much better than either one of the other two. I do have one question, though, and I'm just a little concerned and curious about it. Have you widened either one of those two porches for the deck, the James Street side you have?

Mr. Sanchez: Yeah.

Chairman Cameron: So you widened it. The ones on the south side actually is marked as being 5 foot 8, whereas the James Street one is marked as 5 foot 3. Yet the James Street one is bigger, so I'm sort of curious which one's which.

Mr. Twine: You mean the porch?

Chairman Cameron: Yes.

Mr. Twine: No, I think they both should be the same size.

Mr. Sanchez: They're 5 foot 8 from the interior of the wall nearest to that.

Mr. Twine: I might have done that, yes.

Chairman Cameron: So they're both 5 foot 3? Have you widened both of them? I just don't have the prior drawing here.

Mr. Twine: I believe the porch is equal width, front and side. There might be an area, maybe mentioning, but the porch is ...

Mr. Sanchez: Well, for the record the porch has never been changed at all.

Chairman Cameron: They haven't been changed.

Mr. Sanchez: Never. Never been changed or altered (ph).

Chairman Cameron: That was the original question. Maybe we can decide on a size of tree, like a 6-inch caliper. Would that work?

Boardmember Alligood: Asking Richard?

Chairman Cameron: Richard? I'd like to get this thing either voted up or down tonight, and I think we need to have a tree size in order to have a proper resolution.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Which tree are you talking about?

Chairman Cameron: I'm talking about the American holly.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Then you have to decide if you're willing to trade the other one for the arborvitaes.

Chairman Cameron: Right. Well, for a number of arborvitaes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yeah.

Chairman Cameron: Let's see if the co-owner or whatever ...

Boardmember Bass: Could I ask you, on the location of the trees, 6-inch centered in that space – not where it's currently on the site plan – a second matching tree in the to-be-removed asphalt, centered.

Chairman Cameron: That would work well.

Boardmember Bass: The 8 feet between the shed and the property line, I'm not sure that's sufficient. And I'll defer to your greater knowledge on landscape, but something should be there.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you.

Boardmember Bass: And I would relocate the shed to a less prominent location. Also, on the High Street side there's a planting area that mostly is filled with weeds. So there should be some hedges, appropriate landscaping, there. And then I'll be quiet. A 6-inch caliper would be fine. But I'll defer to you. You know trees better than I do.

Chairman Cameron: Now, this is her garage. It's right behind, on the property line. Is that correct?

Boardmember Bass: Right.

Village Attorney Whitehead: A detached garage.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah. I mean, the real advantage of the tree, where we put it in our prior request and you drew it in, is that it actually really will hide the stairs. The problem with the trees where you are suggesting now, between the shed and the garage, is that it's not going to hide anything. Because the garage, quite frankly, has got to be 10 feet high. It's going to hide everything for a long time. So the other one was in a much better position. If the tree you are planting, this ironwood tree, it's not going to have any branches for 5 or 6 feet, especially if you make it as tall as you're suggesting. So kids can play underneath it, no problem at all.

Mr. Sanchez: Right.

Chairman Cameron: So I'm not sure that's a real issue. I think the tree was in the right spot and should probably stay there. Because we're trying to hide the stairs, and putting them behind the shed isn't going to get us there.

Mr. Twine: And you were more in favor of putting this here and using that tree.

Chairman Cameron: Right where it is.

Mr. Twine: OK, right. The chairman is saying that he favors that location for the tree rather than there.

Chairman Cameron: Leave it right where it is. The shed, I don't think, makes any difference.

Mr. Twine: Mr. Sanchez thinks he can leave the tree where it is. And to put a particular size on it?

Village Attorney Whitehead: So we're leaving both trees where they are.

Chairman Cameron: Leave both trees where they are, but we were thinking of putting two smaller trees on the James Street side – one in the piece of land where the asphalt has been removed.

Mr. Twine: So we get rid of the asphalt, and you need a tree in that area as well?

Boardmember Bass: Yes.

Chairman Cameron: I think what we're talking about is putting two 6-inch trees on that piece of land there.

Mr. Twine: OK.

Chairman Cameron: And then one where the existing one is.

Mr. Twine: Here, and here?

Chairman Cameron: Yes. That's to hide that whole thing. And then the other one where you drew the tree earlier. Because I don't think putting it behind the shed's going to do

anybody any good. It's just a waste of time behind the shed. I understand if you put a holly in it grows close to the ground, but if you put in the ...

Mr. Twine: [off-mic], but it's just a suggestion. We would consult with someone which is ...

Chairman Cameron: Yeah. If you put the ironwood in, then it will actually have a clearance underneath it which will allow kids to play under it and what have you, which is the point that you made.

Mr. Sanchez: That'd be great.

Chairman Cameron: How does everybody feel? Pretty good?

Mr. Sanchez: What size is that ironwood?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Similar, 6-inch caliper.

Mr. Sanchez: Six-inch on the ironwood?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Ironwood, or similar?

Chairman Cameron: Right. And you're going to remove the asphalt. We're going to put this in the resolution.

Mr. Twine: Remove asphalt.

Chairman Cameron: Remove the asphalt. And you're going to put the curb back in for that asphalt where you've taken the asphalt out.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Are those both hollies?

Chairman Cameron: Those two are hollies. Two hollies, one ironwood. Quite candidly, guys, we're doing this because we want to move you along. But we'd have been much happier if you'd come up with a good planning program, we'd looked it, and say it looks good to us. But that didn't happen, and we want to get this thing done.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: And all other plantings stay the same, as presented?

Chairman Cameron: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yeah, the forsythias.

Chairman Cameron: Can I have a motion? I'll read a possible motion.

Boardmember Bass: Can I ask a question? I assume that if the landscaping dies, since it's a requirement of the site plan that the landscaping must be replaced or it's a violation of the C of O. Is that correct.

Chairman Cameron: Mm-hmm.

Boardmember Bass: So I don't have to make that as part of the motion.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: That's forever.

Boardmember Bass: I just want that clarification.

On MOTION of Boardmember Sullivan, SECONDED by Boardmember Bass with a voice vote of 5 to 0 (Boardmember Ambrozek abstained), the Board approved the application by Yvonne and Raymond Sanchez for site plan approval for the addition and alterations to their multi-family dwelling at 46 High Street, also known as SBL: 4.110-115-12 on the Village tax maps, in accordance with the plans presented with the revision date of January 22, 2015, and a received stamp of the Building Department dated January 30, 2015, with the following additional requirements: 1) to put two 6-inch caliber American Holly trees on the James Street side; 2) remove the asphalt, except for where the three parking spaces are; 3) replace the curbcut; and 4) put another Ironwood tree or equivalent, also 6-inch caliber, between the shed and the stairs, essentially as shown on the plans.

Chairman Cameron: One, two, three, four – we just made it. I understand you had points.

Thank you very much.

Boardmember Sullivan: Thank you.

Mr. Twine: Thank you.

Mr. Sanchez: Thank you.

Boardmember Sullivan: Thank you for coming.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you for coming, right.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's going to change the coverage so it's going to change the variances.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS - None

IX. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Informal Review of Proposed Townhouses at 32-34 Washington Avenue.

Chairman Cameron: We now move to a discussion item, a formal discussion item, of a concept for townhouses at 32-34 Washington Avenue. Christina Griffin will make a presentation on this.

While Christina's setting up, for the people who work here we're thinking of moving the meeting in March to the 24th. Then we could go to that 19th of March conference.

Boardmember Sullivan: There's so many interesting ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: And not be mad at me?

Chairman Cameron: So we're thinking the 24th?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: You want to change the date of the meeting?

Chairman Cameron: If you have a moment, when you're looking in the calendar.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Buddy, I already told them they can't move that to Wednesday because the Board of Trustees move from Tuesday to Wednesday.

Chairman Cameron: Tuesday, the 24th.

Boardmember Bass: So that'd be Tuesday, the 24th.

Chairman Cameron: So we got five people that say yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I'll expect to see all of you there.

Chairman Cameron: I can only promise you one of us. I want to be able to say we changed it for you.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: So what date are we looking to have the meeting now?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Tuesday, the 24th of March.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: That's not a Board of Trustees night?

Village Attorney Whitehead: No, they meet the week before.

Boardmember Bass: I have a new job and a new e-mail.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: I was going to talk to you after the meeting.

Chairman Cameron: Oh, do you really? You moved?

Boardmember Bass: Yeah, after 15 years I switched teams. I'm with Akerman. They're a Miami firm building a New York office.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yeah, I need your cell number and your new e-mail address.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Christina Griffin, architect: Good evening. We're here for just an informal discussion to get some of your feedback on a new proposal for this property located at 32-34 Washington Avenue. I'm the architect, and I was engaged to look at new ideas that are different than the scheme that you saw last year.

This is a sketch that I prepared to just give you an idea of the kind of building now that we're looking at. We've got gable roofs, we've got porches. There are now five units: four 3-bedroom townhouses and one 2-bedroom townhouse. Previously there was a seven-unit scheme, and the design for that building was quite different. This is our new site plan, and we are showing the five townhouses. This now is set back further from the front property line because what we'd like to do is to preserve most of the evergreen trees that are in front.

What we thought we would do is maybe take some out and prune them. But we've decided that this would be a very nice way of keeping a privacy barrier and a screen between the residences and Warburton Avenue, which is a pretty busy street at times.

This new scheme is also showing more greenspace than the previous scheme. We're going to have the townhouses cover most of the driveway. I'm going to show you another slide that compares the scheme that you saw last year to the one that we're showing here. We also are treating the front of the building with porches, and we have this little octagonal piece on the northern end.

This is our table of zoning data. We're showing a comparison of the previous scheme for lot A and the current scheme. Lot A is the lot that has the old convent building on it. Lot B, we're showing the comparison between the previous scheme and the current scheme. Now, the major differences in the old versus the new is that we have – if you go down to the bottom – a reduction in the development coverage of the buildings. I think we should look at maximum building coverage. I don't know if it would help for me to come and point this to you – maybe this is easier. Maximum building coverage: lot A had 41 percent building coverage, and we've reduced it by 9.9 percent, almost 10 percent, to 31. We've done this by removing some dilapidated little bump-outs in the back of this building and a lot of the hardscape, the porch – well, it's really pavement – in the back of the building. The difference between the old and the new scheme is almost a 10 percent reduction in the building coverage.

On lot B, which is where we have our five townhouses, we have gone from a previous scheme of a 45 percent building coverage. You know, building coverage is the building plus all the hardscape – the walks and the driveway – down to 39 percent building coverage, which is a difference of 6 percent. I think it might be better just to show the next slide, which'll show, graphically, the difference. This is the last scheme that was submitted to the Planning Board. This is something that's done by a different architect. We're working with the same civil engineer. The previous scheme, lot A – which is the old building, actually two units, a two-family building – had a building coverage of 41 percent. We reduced that to 31 percent. We've done that by removing a lot of these walks and hardscape.

Chairman Cameron: You're off the side.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It doesn't show up on the other screen.

Ms. Griffin: It's not on my screen.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Raf?

Boardmember Ambrozek: Now it's gone.

Chairman Cameron: Voice command.

Ms. Griffin: The property line – the division between the two lots – is in the same location. The lot sizes are the same. The difference on lot A is simply a reduction in the hardscape. We want to just get rid of a lot of these deteriorated bump-outs and all these walks, and reduce it. In fact, we're probably going to end up having just one single walk up to the porch. So once you get up to the porch, you can enter one of the two units that are here. On lot B, the last scheme showed seven units. This is a multi-family building with entrances to five units in the back – or there's five entrances in the back – and three in the front. Somehow they're divided up that way. But a total of seven units. We had a driveway here with a retaining wall around it because this driveway allowed you to get access under the building.

Now, our new scheme, instead of a multi-family, seven-unit building we're going to have five townhouses. We've pushed the building back because we want to preserve the evergreen trees. So we have about a 30-foot setback front and back. We have covered this tunnel-like driveway and we've eliminated that high retaining wall here. We've reduced the amount of hardscape in general, and the difference between the two in building development is a reduction of 6 percent. Just having smaller walks and, when you enter the building, the entry to each of these townhouses is from shared porches. Now when you enter into the garage, you go underneath a porch and then take a left. The garage, which meets the zoning code for number of spaces for the five units, is entirely underneath the building. Which is really good for a lot of things, like you reduce your heat island effect when you cover pavement with a building. What we're trying to do is maximize the amount of greenspace on this property.

This is just another comparison of coverage. In the past, there was a study done in different colors to show how the building coverage broke down into different elements such as walls, sidewalk, building. This chart is comparing the last scheme to the current scheme on lot A and the last scheme to the current scheme on lot B. The biggest change is really not so much the building. Lot A, the building got a little smaller because of the little bump-outs we took off. But it's mostly the reduction in sidewalk on lot A, and on lot B the hardscape that we reduce is mostly also sidewalk and driveway.

Now, this is our site. This is the old convent building, and this is the porch that runs across the front. What we'd like to do, ultimately, is see if we can just have one entry that takes you to the porch, and then one unit will be on one side, one on the other. You can see it's a very handsome brick building with a gable roof, traditional double hung windows. On the back of

the house, you might get some idea of what's going on here. We want to clean that up, eliminate some of these bump-outs and the concrete in back. This is just a side view showing the front and back porches. This is the side of the site where you can see this high group of evergreen trees and the stone wall below. The idea is that we're going to do a cutout on one end for the driveway into the building, another opening that allows you to walk up steps into a common walk that leads to the porches. We had a surveyor come out and measure the height of these trees, and we have heights that vary from 37 to 39 feet. And that's not including the really tall one on the end. Our building – in the back, from the lowest point to the highest point – our proposed building, is about 34 feet.

This is a 3-D view of the proposed townhouses. The idea is to have very similar building to the convent building, but perhaps in different materials. I'm also thinking about what kind of building really fits in this area. I know Warburton Avenue well. I've lived on Warburton Avenue for two years and I've done about 10 properties. There is an interesting transition in this area where you're going from the downtown and you're going to smaller residential buildings, but especially on Washington Avenue. There are lots of these 2-1/2 story – 2-1/2, 3-story buildings – that have porches on them and it looks very village-like. Some of them are close together, and on Warburton some of them are actually attached. But instead of doing the flat roofs in a downtown-type building, I felt that this – and this corner – needs to be sort of transitional, where maybe it picks up on the theme of those buildings you see with the porches on Washington Avenue, but could be closer together like some of the buildings further south on Warburton Avenue.

We're showing the setback. This is actually the view without the trees, and this is the view with the trees. We want to clean up these trees – cut some of them, maybe some of them out – because we counted 38 evergreen trees, quite a few of them. And they're not perfectly lined up. It's sort of a jungle. But it still actually helps to like sort of soften the fact that there's ... I mean the view, it helps with the view from the building of the gas station across the street. And actually we don't think there's going to be a river view here.

Anyway, that's the idea that we might use different materials. These buildings jog in and out. We want to make them look like townhouses, and not one big building. I want to really break up the mass, have different dormers just to articulate the roof. We're not trying to create necessarily a third floor, but to have an interesting roofline and, of course, traditional-looking porches with nice railings and entries.

Now, we have to do more study about the building and about the views, but I just wanted to give you some information about the site and what at least our firm has explored to date. This is an aerial view of the site. These are the evergreen trees, this is the old common building. We've started to take some views from the neighboring building uphill to try to

understand what kind of impact the building might have on their views. We were able to get into this one house. This is our first view, on William Street. In this view, you can see the trees are way down here. There's a tremendous grade difference between these houses up here and our site down there, so that from this house you actually can see those tall, 38-foot high evergreen trees and yet that house looks way over them.

So our building's going to be down here, and eventually we'll be coming back to you with our building superimposed on these photographs. This is a view looking at the properties from William Street. These two actually have a blow-up of each of those in case you'd like to see that. These views are from William Street, and this is from Washington Avenue.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Your mouse isn't working now.

Ms. Griffin: I'm sorry.

This is a blowup of the house looking down. This is the evergreen trees. This is another view going down William Street, down looking through the properties. We're thinking that our building's actually beyond this little building here, this building in the trees. This is the common building. These are just views, and we're trying to see if we can see from Washington Avenue into our site. We can. This is a peek between the common building, the next house up, and you can see the evergreen trees. There's some very large trees even higher than that.

We'd really like to know if you have any thoughts and you could perhaps just give us some feedback tonight that might help us decide which direction we should go.

Chairman Cameron: So, Chris, did you take a picture from Aqueduct Lane, from those parking areas on Aqueduct Lane? I didn't see one from there.

Ms. Griffin: You know, I haven't done a full view analysis. But we'll make sure we pick that up, yeah.

Boardmember Alligood: I just think it's a vast improvement over the previous scheme. Already, just the thought that went into really trying to pick up from other buildings around it and not stick out is something that's just completely out of character. I really like that you're keeping the trees and not kind of ... in the other scheme, it felt like everything was stripped away and that you would just be looking at this hulking building from the road. This really shields the development from the street, and vice versa. I'm sure the people in those buildings would rather be looking at the trees than across to the gas station. Also, just eliminating ... we all agreed we did not like that huge driveway that was sort of almost like a

canyon into the property.

So I see it just as a ... I can picture this not being a huge eyesore, which the previous schemes just were.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I found this much more attractive, as well. And I like your approach that they're not all identical in height. And obviously you could use different textures on the exterior, you can do different window treatments so that they look like they were built at different times, perhaps. The fact that you're trying to capture the village atmosphere really is good, and I also like that you are trying to retain most, if not all, the trees.

I have one little comment. There are 10 parking spaces. You say that 10 of them are handicap.

Ms. Griffin: One is handicap.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Oh, one. OK, that was a typo. The only other thought I had was, how do you plan to handle the refuse and facilities and things for the building?

Ms. Griffin: We are probably going to put them under the porches. I think we'll have about 4-1/2 feet under the porches in the front, and they could be pulled out and either brought down here or down to this walk.

Boardmember Ambrozek: OK.

Ms. Griffin: We're going to have more information on that when we do an official submission.

Boardmember Alligood: I have a question. Are you going to be the architect to draw the entire scheme, and then come back to us with all the details?

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Boardmember Alligood: Because of the submission had ... the previous ...

Ms. Griffin: It's just because of time. We weren't able to coordinate with the engineer as well as we wanted to, especially since the engineer in charge of this has been away the last two weeks.

Boardmember Alligood: I guess I expressed that when we convey anything to the owner that it would be problematic if we got sort of the general scheme from you, but then it was executed under the old scheme.

Ms. Griffin: The owner is there.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, way over there.

Ms. Griffin: I guess you can't see the owner, but in case you'd like to clarify that?

Chairman Cameron: He's smiling at the right point.

Andrew Cortese, project developer: Good evening. No, Christina will be the architect of record and she'll be taking it from this point to the finish line. And also, John Myers – James C. – is going to be engineer of record also, and doing all the work obviously.

Boardmember Alligood: We've had a long conversation with this project, so we don't want to have to backtrack. At least that's my ... I don't want to say "we." I don't know how others feel, but I think this is a much better direction and I'd like to move on from there. And going back to something ...

[cross-talk]

Mr. Cortese: (Inaudible) positive things. So I agree.

Chairman Cameron: One question I have about the parking. The people, when they park their cars, do they have to walk back out, do the route when they come out? There's no interior stairs. You haven't thought of that, or you're ...

Ms. Griffin: We haven't gotten to that point. We know that we have a little extra space here beyond what's required for the turnaround, and are required by New York State code to have one handicapped-accessible unit. You know, tonight's kind of a turning point for us. If we feel that we're getting some good feedback from you, and we feel that this is the right direction for the project, we're going to continue to develop it. And that's one thing we need to look into.

Chairman Cameron: One of the problems – and it's not your problem, it's a psychological problem – is that we have – further down the road, where we have affordable units – is that what happens is that we believe that rather than parking in their own parking lot they just grab a spot in front of the house, if there is one.

Ms. Griffin: Oh, I know that well.

Chairman Cameron: I know. So the one thing, in looking at this – and, like Eva, I very much like this a lot better than the prior one – to find a way to attract people to put their bloody car in their parking space rather than leaving it on the street. Now, they may not have much choice because, quite frankly, that very nice garage across the street dominates the parking.

Boardmember Alligood: I'm a lot less concerned about that problem. Because who is going to want to park on the street and trudge all their groceries and things they're bringing. It's not like the other project; it's very convenient to the street.

Chairman Cameron: Right.

Mr. Cortese: Especially with this weather, right?

Boardmember Alligood: I think people are going to want to have their cars tucked away underneath without snow on them. I mean, maybe in the summer it'll be different.

Ms. Griffin: I think it'd be really nice, if we can, to get an entrance up to these porches from the garage so people wouldn't have to come out. And yeah, everyone always ... usually people follow the path of least resistance. So if we did that, then I think people would come in and then probably take their groceries up through the building rather than park here. We hope.

Boardmember Sullivan: I have a couple of comments. I have to echo what some of the other Boardmembers have said. The sketch that you put forth showing the imagery for this building is very appealing. And it picks up on at least one building type that's in this area, which is more of a single-family home. I won't say it doesn't, but there are other types of buildings. It's a very unusual area of Hastings, and I think you said it well by calling it transitional. There also is a brick motif that's going on and some other types, which I'll get to in a second.

If you wouldn't mind going back to the site plan, the issue I've had with the previous scheme is the lack of thought behind the parking for the existing building. I really dislike having parking in the front yard or whatever yard it is along Washington. It would be something I would like you to look at is how to make sure – as lovely as this new addition might be – that the existing building is treated with the same kind of respect. This is a variation on what we saw, but I really don't think that's a ... I'd like to see a better solution to the four parking

spaces that are needed for that particular piece of property. We haven't settled on where that property line is. That's sort of something that's been around since the previous schemes of a couple years ago.

The other thought I had is, you talked about how the previous scheme and this scheme had differences in coverage. But really, what it came down to was the treatment of sidewalks and things that were for circulation. Despite the appeal of your sketch and the imagery for the townhouses, I'm still concerned about the bulk of the proposed addition on this site. Because one of the things that this site can offer is some space around it in ways that other properties potentially can't because this zone is a crazy zone.

I kind of feel like sometimes I'm always talking about the numbers and the setbacks and that type of thing. It's just difficult to even think about applying it in this particular situation. But my perspective is, visually, I would like to see the footprint of the building be smaller. The last two schemes, what's happened is this actually is an area that can have three stories. You could potentially decrease the bulk of the building footprint, allowing some more breathing space – maybe a way to get that parking out of the front yard in Washington – and use that third story to give you the square footage that you might need for additional apartments.

What I also wanted to mention – and this is something I've been thinking about especially in relationship to another proposal that we've seen – is this idea that the only multi-family option is a townhouse. Jamie brought this up kind of late on a number of projects, actually the one that Christina was working on down on Warburton that's in construction right now. I won't say too late in the game, but late in the game, Jamie mentioned something about looking instead of doing townhouses maybe doing flats. I think I'd like to bring that up as a point of discussion.

I think it's sort of interesting that we've seen a lot of townhouses, and it seems to be the thinking that in a certain kind of residential market you have to have a townhouse. For me, that's Clarewood, that's Hastings Landing – you know, those are fine examples of townhouses and they've been around here. But that idea gets transposed and put in this area, which is an area that has a lot of examples of things like – and that's where I get to a brick option – some very beautiful three-story buildings that are brick. I think I could foresee a taller and smaller building, maybe in a different imagery than what you're looking at right now, fitting this corner quite well. Especially with the beauty of that old convent building adjacent.

Again, first off is really some thought behind the parking for the existing building. And then I feel aesthetically and kind of instinctively that it would be better to have a smaller footprint. And potentially, by exploring a third story instead of these two-story options, you may find –

the owner may find – some development opportunities in that. And I think it would be worth considering, at this point, looking at other multi-family types besides a townhouse.

Ms. Griffin: I'd like to say in response to that, I've actually been doing quite a few multi-family and townhouse type projects. Because there is almost now like an interest in the downtowns. It's really spilling out from Manhattan, where a lot of people can't get that home they want in Manhattan so they wonder, well, why don't we look at the downtown. There's like a complete turnaround. People are thinking that it would be really nice to live near a downtown, in walking distance. I feel if you give somebody their own parking spot and their own piece of land instead of a shared hallway and a common space it is more attractive. You know, each person can have their own little lot in the back, each person have – or sometimes share – a porch. But by breaking it up and giving people their own little independent unit I think you're going to get this feeling of home ownership, a feeling of pride.

You have a lot of this going on on Warburton Avenue. I'd like to show you examples down the street. There's quite a few of these two-, three-, four-story buildings with porches; sometimes they're two-family, sometimes they're three-family, sometimes they're single-family. But a lot of them are not organized horizontally like an apartment building.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, I understand. We also have 45 Main as an example of the more traditional ... something like I'm mentioning.

Ms. Griffin: 45 Main?

Boardmember Sullivan: Yeah, where it's set up as regular apartments with shared corridors. That's been successful in our town. I would say I understand your perspective, I just want to bring it up to the Board as something we might want to talk about as an option.

Ms. Griffin: If you did a study of Hastings, of the downtown and Washington Avenue and Warburton Avenue, you will see that many of the façades are about 20 to 25 feet wide, just like this. If you don't create that module, if you don't break it up, you lose the sense of scale of a village. And like 45 Main, you have a very large ...

Boardmember Sullivan: I mentioned that only because that particular housing type exists in our village, as well. I agree with you that the articulation that you're doing – the breaking down of this façade – is helpful, very much helpful. And that module that you're talking about I think is very appropriate. I'm just saying I think there's other imagery, there's other building types. This is a very interesting area of our town 'cause it's got a lot of different things going on. You can point to examples of anything that you're interested in because it's

just that diverse.

Back to my point, the bulk of this building has not changed from the previous proposal dramatically, and that's a concern of mine. So I just share decreasing the footprint, getting some more open space, and dealing with that parking Washington which is not really very well thought out. I'm just offering that if you decrease the bulk you have the option to go to a three-story potential.

Ms. Griffin: I want to explain another thing. This parking garage is as tight as it can be for 10 spaces, which is what we need for five units. We went from seven to five, so that's one reason why it's the bulk that it is. But also, instead of having the shape of the building changed it's not as deep so we could have more greenspace in the front and back. It's a little longer. The previous scheme is deeper; it's almost the same footprint. I really believe, as an architect, it's not just the footprint, the 2-D shape on a piece of paper. It's actually articulation, how we break up the rooflines, the different heights, the different porches, the different materials. This breaks up mass tremendously. I see the difference between 45 Main and then Warburton Avenue.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'm not picking on 45 Main.

Ms. Griffin: No, I just think that's an exception. Most of the Village has lots of little buildings with only a 20- to 25-foot façade, and I've studied them very carefully.

Boardmember Alligood: I'm not convinced that as you're walking down the street that it's going to feel ... I think the massing is going to feel more imposing by going up. Because you're already up off the street, you're quite high up off the street. So I actually responded positively to the fact that it was at the height you show it.

Boardmember Sullivan: Eva, without getting into designing it, the height they're at is, she said, 39 feet.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The height of the trees.

Boardmember Sullivan: But the height ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: What's your height, Christina?

Boardmember Ambrozek: It's 37.6.

Boardmember Sullivan: They only can go 40, so it's very similar in height. It's basically

the gable roof.

Boardmember Alligood: Oh, you're proposing going up.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, no, no, no. It's like they're almost there now anyway. But again, it gets back to the amount of building on this site. And the fact that the Washington property doesn't have the parking situation that I think is good for it.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I was the one that brought up the flats. I think it actually would have worked better in 400 Warburton because you have more windows on the outside. But that's that building, it's not this building.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right.

Chairman Cameron: And I agree this building is long enough that the idea of flats probably would not work that well and this works better. I like the idea, quite frankly, to move it further back. Because that reduces the feeling that you have this big building looming over Warburton. I think also the way you've treated it by breaking up the floors works well. So I'm encouraged with this.

Boardmember Bass: The width of your floor plate is only 42 feet?

Ms. Griffin: The width of the floor plate ... the length from the back?

Boardmember Bass: Right, from the front to the back.

Ms. Griffin: Without the porch it's about 40 feet.

Boardmember Bass: OK. I like the articulation, I like the scale of it. I agree with Kathy, the parking solution on Washington is awkward, at best, and there's probably a simpler way of having four parking spaces without using that much asphalt. I'm not troubled by this design. And it's a vast improvement over what we saw last time, which I thought was pretty bad.

Boardmember Alligood: It may be a situation where we don't all agree, but you got a payback (ph).

Chairman Cameron: The problem with the parking on Washington, first of all you've got to make sure that people only exit going up the hill. Otherwise we'll kill some people. The second thing is, you've got too much of an entryway and turnaround area compared to the

parking spots. But I don't have an answer to making it better right now. It's just the yellow's too big. I know that's what it is, but for the amount of spots you have the yellow is visually ... I mean, it's painfully too big. I don't know how to make it smaller.

Ms. Griffin: What are you talking about?

Chairman Cameron: The yellow. It's just too big, but I don't have an easy answer.

Ms. Griffin: I haven't actually really looked at that yet.

Chairman Cameron: The fishtail, in fact, was – I hate to say – a suggestion of mine. And that was to make it look smaller and put a tree between the two pieces of the fishtail, if you want to know where that came from.

Ms. Griffin: All right, well, we'll certainly take a look at it. Thank you so much. We appreciate it.

Chairman Cameron: One thing just before we quit, we need to have a table of zoning data. The next time we meet we should have a better discussion of what variances you need.

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Chairman Cameron: Because that's something we'll have to think about, you have to think about.

Ms. Griffin: I said earlier, we don't need an interpretation of the height of the building. Because that affects our minimum setback [off-mic].

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Christina, I'm sorry.

Boardmember Sullivan: What's the question?

Ms. Griffin: We have, for MR-1.5, the minimum setback is either 12 feet or half of the building height –

Village Attorney Whitehead: Building wall.

Ms. Griffin: – building wall, I'm sorry – next, closest to that property line. But what does that mean? We have an explanation down here on our chart that we were given – or the previous applicant was given – an interpretation from Deven Sharma, that it was grade to the

attic floor. But we're starting anew now, and I'd like to get that pinned down because we really don't know exactly what the minimum setback is until we know what wall height means. Is it from lowest to the top point?

Village Attorney Whitehead: The term "building wall" is not a defined term.

Chairman Cameron: Right.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's used, but it's not a defined term.

Ms. Griffin: If you take it literally, Jamie explained, we could actually say ... like, say it's 35 feet at the peak. Half of that's 17.5. But then down here the top is 26 feet, and half of that's 13.

Chairman Cameron: Right.

Ms. Griffin: So do we have a setback that goes from 13 to 17.5?

Chairman Cameron: Or do you take the average down the left of the building?

Boardmember Sullivan: I'm telling you, this project's going to make all our definitions make so much better sense. We're going to deal with what is "wall"? That's a basic philosophical question.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It says building wall, and we were looking it before. It's an odd provision, using an undefined term.

Ms. Griffin: There's no definition of building wall.

Boardmember Sullivan: Have fun.

Ms. Griffin: OK, thanks a lot.

Boardmember Bass: Thank you.

X. ADJOURNMENT

XI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting Date – March 24, 2015

Chairman Cameron: We adjourned the meeting, but the other thing is that it looks like we've got enough people to come on the 24th. So I'm going to canvas the two missing members, then move the meeting to the 24th. Bill, I know, is in Australia but he responded with an e-mail. I don't know where Kerry is, but I'll send out an e-mail.