

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
APRIL 16, 2015**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, April 16, 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 Kerry Gould-Schmit, Boardmember Kathleen Sullivan, Boardmember Richard Bass, Boardmember William O'Reilly (late arrival), Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, Deputy Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., and Deputy Village Clerk Mary Ellen Ballantine

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of February 19, 2015

Chairman Cameron: Now we're going to move to the approval, or review and approval, of the minutes of February 19, 2015. Does anybody have any comments on these minutes? I'll go first.

On page 34, one of us speaking but he's referred to as Mr. Cortese, the developer. You might just look at that and try to figure out who it is.

On page 35, I'm speaking, about a quarter of the way down the page. And I say, "*We need to have ...*" and then it goes dot, dot, dot. It's the table of zoning data, if you just put those words in.

Did anyone else have any comments?

On MOTION of Boardmember Sullivan, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of 4 in favor [Boardmember Gould-Schmit abstained; Boardmember O'Reilly not present at time of motion], the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of February 19, 2015 were approved as amended.

Chairman Cameron: I would point out that we are missing Bill O'Reilly at this point in

time.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And I am abstaining. I wasn't here in February.

III. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Accessory Apartment Permit Renewal – Application of Betty Ming Liu – 243 Farragut Parkway – SBL: 4.110-109-12. Waiver required for square footage.**

Chairman Cameron: Buddy, can you give us a report?

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yeah, there's been no changes to this accessory apartment since our last inspection. We've received no complaints in the last three years. There is a waiver needed for this accessory apartment of ... it's 29.4 percent of the primary dwelling, which is 4.4 percent over what's allowed by code so she's looking for a coverage waiver of 4.4 percent. And she does have off-street parking.

Chairman Cameron: Terrific. Does anybody on the Board have any comments on this application? Is there anybody in the audience, including the owner, who would like to comment? I would entertain a motion if somebody would like to make it.

On MOTION of Boardmember Bass, SECONDED by Boardmember Sullivan with a voice vote of 5 in favor (Boardmember O'Reilly not present during motion), the Board resolved to approve the application for a renewal of the accessory apartment permit of Betty Ming Liu, 243 Farragut Parkway, on what is known as SBL: 4.110-109-12 on the Village tax maps, with a waiver required for square footage.

2. **Accessory Apartment Permit Renewal – Application of Dr. Zena Susser – 100 Pinecrest Drive – SBL: 4.130-139-6. Waiver required for square footage.**

Chairman Cameron: The second item is another accessory apartment permit renewal. Buddy, can you give us a report?

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Just give me one second. Again, this accessory apartment has not changed in the three years since our last inspection. We haven't received any

complaints of this accessory apartment in the last three years, as well. But the apartment area is 33 percent of the principal, which would be 8 percent over what is required by local code, so we're recommending approval with an 8 percent overage in coverage. They do have off-street parking.

Chairman Cameron: Terrific. Anybody on the Board have any comments? Any comments from the audience? We did receive one letter in favor for this approval. I'm not going to bother reading it, since I think we are ready to take a vote.

On MOTION of Boardmember Alligood, SECONDED by Boardmember Sullivan with a voice vote of 5 in favor (Boardmember O'Reilly not present during motion), the Board resolved to approve the application for renewal of the accessory apartment permit of Dr. Zena Susser, 100 Pinecrest Drive, known as SBL: 4.130-139-6 on the Village tax maps, with a waiver required for square footage.

3. View Preservation and Site Plan Approval – Application of CCI Properties, LLC for the construction of an additional building containing 5 townhouse units on its property at 32-34 Washington Ave. Said property is located in the MR-1.5 zoning district and is known as SBL: 4.70-53-11 on the Village Tax Maps.

Chairman Cameron: So now the next item on our agenda is view preservation and site plan approval application of CCI Properties, LLC. The reason I read out all these long numbers, by the way, is that they go to the minutes. And if, later on, you want to find out something particular that went on with this property you can just do a search in the minutes using that number and the topic will pop, hopefully, on the screen.

They have to get set up so you can see and we can see.

Christina Griffin, architect for project: I'm engaged by CCI Properties to design these townhouses that are at the corner of Warburton Avenue and Washington Avenue. The address is actually 32-34 Washington Avenue. This is just a 3-D image of the townhouses that we're proposing. They're 2-1/2 story townhouses. They're going to be 4 three-bedroom townhouses and 1 two-bedroom townhouse. This image is a design that shows porches in front and gables and dormers that reflect a lot of the architecture that's in the neighborhood.

This is our site plan. There is an existing two-family house here right now. This used to be a rectory, and it's been here for, I know, at least a hundred years. We are planning to keep this

intact and renovate it one day. We are going to take some of the hardscape away from the back of the building – there are these little shed additions – so we can sort of clean up the building. We're showing a redevelopment of a driveway that already exists. We're going to be paving it with pervious pavement and giving this area a turnaround so you can back out and then go into the street without ... you can turn around without backing out. We're, in effect, making this a much safer driveway.

The other idea that we have, of course, is our new building we're proposing. What we are intending to do is to have the two buildings share one lot. This building meets all the setbacks, but will need a variance for lot coverage. The driveway will be off of Warburton Avenue. This is a driveway that allows access to a garage underneath that allows for 10 parking spaces. Also, there will be a turnaround inside the garage so you can turn around when you come out and wouldn't have to back out of the driveway to get onto Warburton Avenue.

This is just showing a common walk that's going to give access to the front of each of these units. Each one will have a porch, and then a main staircase and walk that's going to come through the retaining wall that exists on the western side of the property.

Now, these are our cross-sections. This is a section through the site, taken through the proposed 2-1/2 story building. This is the basement where the garage will be. There will be a driveway coming from Warburton Avenue to the garage that will be a 3 percent slope, which meets the code for a 3 percent driveway within 20 of the property line.

We will have two stories for each unit, and an unfinished attic. We decided to do this attic because we wanted the building to have a gable roof that was about 8 in 12 slope, which is what I think the slope is of the old rectory house. The square footage of the three-family units will be 1,870 square feet, and the square footage of the 1 two-bedroom unit is going to be 1,200 square feet. This section shows the 50-foot maximum building height that we're going to be under, where we actually just offset that grade 40 feet and the building fits under that.

This is a cross-section going north to south through the site. This is the existing old building. This is the retaining wall that you see along the sidewalk on Washington Avenue and the porch in front of the old building. This our new building, which is showing 2-1/2 stories cut through the roof and the attic. This is the 40-foot maximum building height, which is run through here right like that.

We also did approximate measurements of the existing building so we could compare them. This one is around 34.9 feet to the bridge; ours is 39.1 to the top. This house, which is

two-story but has a flat roof, is 26 feet high. You can see that it's just about above our attic floor.

Boardmember Sullivan: Christina, can I just ask a quick question? Where is the retaining wall on the south side?

Ms. Griffin: Right here.

Boardmember Sullivan: What elevations are you using? Because that, I believe, is quite higher.

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Boardmember Sullivan: So is that to scale?

Ms. Griffin: I'm going to show you something. There are two retaining walls on the south side. There is a retaining wall – and I wonder if I could blow this up – for 44 linear feet. We have a very low retaining wall at 2 foot 9. Then it jumps up to 13 feet because there used to be a building here in the back.

Boardmember Sullivan: The elevation on the survey for that existing house to the south is 116 feet. So where is that on your diagram on S2, the next one?

Gordon Madris, 467 Warburton Avenue: Excuse me. It's very hard for us to follow this. This should be over here so we can see what she's talking about. I have no idea what she's talking about.

Ms. Griffin: Oh, you know what? I have a pointer.

Chairman Cameron: If you use the pointer maybe it'll show up on the other side.

Ms. Griffin: I'm going to use this pointer. How's that?

Mr. Madris: Better.

Ms. Griffin: Right here – I think you're talking about this retaining wall right here?

Boardmember Sullivan: Right. The house's elevation's at 116, so where's 116 in relationship to the elevations of the new building?

Ms. Griffin: One thing I want to tell you, you've just found something that I don't understand in our survey. Because this morning I went to look at this again, and there is a low retaining wall and then a flat area that goes over to this building. Then beyond that low retaining wall is a very high wall. It's 13 feet high.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right. I'm just saying that that should be re-looked at because I think what you're showing is not necessarily the existing condition of where that house is. Your first-floor level is at 90 – correct? – around 90.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Ninety-one.

Ms. Griffin: Ninety-one.

Boardmember Sullivan: So that house, I went back and looked at the old survey. It was 116, so that's much higher than what you're showing.

Ms. Griffin: I know, but I think you just found something that I think might be an error. I'm going to go back to the surveyor. I'm going to show you a picture of the street, and you're going to see that house you're referring to. I don't know if I can ... I'm going to see if I can blow this up. Let's see if I can get this blown up. That's this house here. I'm sorry, I can't blow this up. But I would like to get back to you on that, and look at it.

Boardmember Sullivan: I went by this morning and saw it. It's not a small wall. So just take a look at it, that section.

Ms. Griffin: OK, but there are two walls on that plot.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, I understand. But I'm just saying the elevation of that house is much higher than what's being shown in that drawing.

Ms. Griffin: OK. But, you know, I am very eager to give you all the information you need. I saw your comments, and I will definitely look into this and get back to you on it. Anyway, the idea was simply to be accurate because we're cutting through here. And we actually had this section at a much higher wall, but when I went back it was a little wall. The survey has a funny elevation for this house here, and I will check it.

This is our section going through the building showing the five units, the garage underneath. Basically, we're trying to keep within the maximum building height and keep the idea of a 2-1/2 story house in height.

This is a lot coverage and density map that was a study that CCI Properties did on the neighborhood. I'm showing this to you because it's important to know that if you took an average of the 24 properties on Washington and William Streets, not including Cropsey, we have an average lot coverage of 41 percent. We're going to be going to the Zoning Board seeking a variance for a 37.8 percent lot coverage. So the lot coverage we're asking for is well within the range of lot coverage on these two streets, and we're only looking at the MR-1.5 zone, not the MR-O or the CC zone. If you look across the street and down this way you'll see properties that have lot coverages (ph) of around 62 percent – 93, 98. We wanted to have this building feel that it's part of this neighborhood with the kind of density that we see here.

Chairman Cameron: Christina, I think actually we better move the screen off to the side.

Ms. Griffin: You know it's funny, I ...

Chairman Cameron: It's the detail which ... all these people, we so have such a good audience and we'd like to let them get a chance to see this.

Ms. Griffin: OK. I think I also have a habit of pointing to the drawing.

Chairman Cameron: I know. That was a very hard one to point at something while you're doing it, but I think that's just a better idea.

Mr. Madris: Thank you.

Ms. Griffin: Sorry.

I don't know what you might have missed, but actually I handed out a color version of this because there's only black and white in the packages. What this study represents is the lot coverages (ph) in the area. This is Washington Avenue, this is Warburton Avenue, and the red is showing all the lot coverages (ph) over 35 percent – all the ones in red over 35 percent. Then I think the green is 16-20 percent, and the yellow is 21-25 percent. We took an average of these 24 properties and came up with 41 percent. The lot coverage for this property with the two buildings on it is going to be 37.8 percent. So this is demonstrating that the lot coverage we're going to be asking for is within the range of lot coverage that already exists, even though on this side they are actually much higher. But we didn't want to count those because they're not in the MR-1.5 zone.

This is our landscape. It's just showing some of the major trees in the area. What we'd like to do is keep the tall evergreen trees in front and kind of clean them up, maybe leave them

out. One reason we're keeping them is because it will give us a nice buffer and privacy screen since there is an auto repair station across the street. We're also showing a few new shade trees because we'd like to give shade to the new paved driveway. Then as much as we can, we're going to do some ground cover along the building and along this swale that we're creating along the south side of the building.

This is the layout plan done by the civil engineers, JMC Engineering. If I can, I'd like to see if I can blow this up. There's a zoning table there just to show that we're going to have a 15.5 foot minimum setback on the side, which meets the zoning code. We're going to set back the front of the building so we can keep the trees and the root system that's there at the porches and entrances to the townhouses. Then we're going to meet the zoning code for the rear yard. I think we have something like 33 feet here.

Cindy Travis, 427 Warburton Avenue: Can you speak up a little?

Ms. Griffin: Thirty feet is the minimum. Then over here, this is the driveway we're proposing. We're going to be asking for just a variance to the 5-foot setback so we can have 4 feet. Our plan there is to give this little narrow space – I'm flipping back here – next to the driveway, provide a hedge and buffer between this paved area and the property next door.

Now, these colors are just representing the different types of hardscape. The dark blue are the buildings, the aquamarine are the porches, the red are the paths, the yellow is the driveway, the dark orange is the parking spaces that we're providing for the old building. The reason for showing you all these different colors is because we just wanted to point out that the building itself – I thought I would be able to blow this up ... the total lot coverage is 37.8, but the building itself without the porches is something like 35 percent. What we really wanted to do is make sure we had these porches because it really gives it a lot of character and sort of picks up on the theme of having porches in front of the houses that you see along Washington Avenue.

Then we have a lot of technical drawings. This is our storm drainage drawing showing a French drain on the back. We have a drop in elevation from 90 to about 84, about 6 feet from the back to the front of the property. So we'll be having swales going around the property. Then this is our CULTEC underground drainage system. This is our driveway layout showing the two driveways we're adding in here. These are just some of our site details showing protection of trees and different drainage details. Here are some of the drainage details.

OK, these are our architectural plans. The basement plan is showing the entrance to the end of the building. This is the new driveway coming into the garage. We're going to have one

handicapped spot with one elevator because we need to provide a handicapped unit by New York State code. We're planning to have waste areas underneath the porches. So they're tucked in under there; you just go down under your porch and pull out the waste. This is our first-floor plan. The access to the entrances is from a common walkway. That walkway connects with a walk going into the garage. There's a separate entrance, a separate porch for most of the units, and a shared porch for the end unit because we have one porch that's going to be over the driveway. This is because we wanted to really kind of tuck the garage entry in as much as possible. These units are laid out so there's like a living room, dining room, kitchen with windows on both ends. Each unit is very similar except for the two-bedroom unit in the middle. This is just a second-floor plan. They're three-bedrooms, two baths for each of the four units; and then a bedroom each side, two baths for the two-bedroom unit. We will also have a door leading to an attic stair.

The three-bedroom units have 1,870 square feet so we're going to give them unfinished attics. That's really ... there are no basements, but it's also because we wanted to get this look. But we have a nice gable roof with a slope that's not too shallow so it really gives that old-house look – with dormers, maybe various sizes and shapes. We're going to have a series of different types of double-hungs and casement windows with maybe two-over-one muntin patterns; porches with maybe slightly varying and different railing styles. And this, again, is to pick up some of the themes we see in the area, some bay windows. And this is the entrance – our common walkway. There's a main stair coming down to the sidewalk at Warburton Avenue. This dash line is actually the sidewalk in front. There's a retaining wall here right now that we're going to extend. You have to come up through that retaining wall to get to this level. We have steps going down to the entrance to the garage, and the garage door for vehicular traffic.

These are side elevations. This is the elevation that you would see from the corner of Warburton and Washington. We wanted to have sort of a special feature there, so we have a little angular porch. These are showing 8 and 12 roofs with a few windows in there for the attic. The shapes of the building and the style was chosen to fit in as much as possible with the other buildings around it. This is the other side of the building looking at the southern façade. This is the rear. You notice the buildings look shorter. That's because the grade has come up. The grade in the back is at elevation 90 and the front is at 84, so we have a rise of 6 feet from front to back. We have lots of doors because these are family rooms facing the common backyard.

These are some views of the site. This is the old house, the two-family house, showing the driveway on the left. This driveway has an opening of 9 feet 10. What we're planning to do is widen it so there are better sight lines when you're turning around and coming out of the driveway. This is a view looking down towards the building. This is a blowup of the

driveway, then this is looking at the porch in two different directions for that building. This view actually is when you're inside the driveway. You can see that the cars are kind of helter-skelter. What we're trying to do, this is already used as parking for this building. We want to give them a nice improved parking area, with a turnaround and a privacy buffer. This is the back of the building.

This is a view of the site. This is the corner, and this is the view looking along Warburton Avenue. This is the house right at the end, at the corner of Warburton and William Street. These are just some views of some of the other buildings in the area showing 2-1/2 story buildings on Washington Avenue; 3-story buildings – this is at the corner of Washington and Warburton; 3-story buildings along Warburton that are actually contiguous; and then some 2-story buildings across the street.

This is a 3-D view that we did of the proposed townhouses. And this is an outline of the townhouse behind the trees just to give you an idea of how that fits there and what the relationship is of the top height of the trees and the height of the building. Just so you know, we did this in SketchUp to get an accurate height and elevation, and then we superimposed it on a photograph. This is a location planning showing the location of our photographs for view preservation. We took about nine photographs from neighboring properties to try to understand what the view might be from these properties, looking through the site, when the building is in place. This is an aerial view, and you can see that where I'm pointing right here is the old rectory building. I'm calling it that, but it's a two-family house right now. Then there's a little building here, a little dilapidated house that we're planning to remove. You can see the tall evergreens along Warburton Avenue right at the edge of the retaining wall. This building here, that white roof, that's the house that's just at the end of this block that I pointed out before.

Now, these are views before and after. Before is on top, and after is on the bottom. This is the view looking from location number one, which is looking from up here just in between these two buildings off William Street. We superimposed the shape of the townhouses into this photograph. What you see, when you look down, you can see the top of the evergreen trees. They vary from 27 to 38 feet from the top of the wall. And you can see the river and the Palisades beyond.

The next photograph, this is before and this is after. This is number two. This is taken in a similar location looking diagonally across the site. You will see the townhouses fitting into that opening, that greenspace, that's there. Then the third view is actually a little bit closer, looking into the site, and you see before and after. I was just trying to see. I didn't know, but we actually did bring the blowups. I wasn't sure. I think those are too hard to see so I'm going to move on to these. This is the first view. This is before, and this is after. This is

looking between the buildings on William Street. This is our second view that's looking more into the site between the first building on William Street.

The next one is a before-and-after. See, these are the tops of the evergreen trees. You can see them just barely above these buildings. This is our next view. This is before, and this is after. I think this is when we're actually looking a little closer into the site. You can see the evergreen trees here that exist. This is the building we're removing, this is the two-family house, and this is where we're proposing putting the new townhouses.

This is a view looking down Washington Avenue; this is before and after. You're going to see now the buildings behind the two-family house. This is looking between ... this is on Washington Avenue, but walking between two houses. This is before, and this is after. This is also ... I think we're going a little bit closer between the two houses. It looks like the before is here, and this is the after. This is a view looking down, looking higher up. I know we got into one of the buildings on the street and we're looking through, I think, a building up on Washington Avenue. This is before, looking down into the site, and this is after. This is the little red house that exists right now, the top of the trees. This is before, and this is after. This is up on the deck of someone's property. Again, this is looking much further up the street, in between the house. This is before, and this is after.

I think this pretty much covers the material we have for you tonight, and I look forward to hearing any comments that you might have.

Boardmember Bass: Well done.

Ms. Griffin: Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: Start out here. Bill, do you have any comments?

Boardmember O'Reilly: Not at the moment. I'll come back later, if I can.

Chairman Cameron: OK. Kathy?

Boardmember Sullivan: I do. Do you mind if I launch into that?

Chairman Cameron: Just go ahead.

Boardmember Sullivan: OK. I'm just going to make a few comments on the materials that we received, starting with the application. It would be useful ... one of the requirements that I interpreted was to have an underground of the variations from the zoning code that you are

requesting. So at some point, that would be useful to have a common understanding of what things you deviated from, and we discuss why and understand that. That was omitted in the application.

For some funny reason, I actually enjoyed reading the SEQRA application assessment form. I know, laugh as you might. There are just some things I'd like to mention. There's some details that I'll share with Buddy as we go along. But I think there are going to be a number of governmental approvals that are going to have to occur. One of them is that Warburton's a county road so at some point you will need to coordinate with Westchester County – I think it's public works. Also, you're making a new water connection, you're making a new sewer connection and gas and electric, so there are potentially approvals as well.

I guess this is a general question: does the ARB have any jurisdiction over this at some point, Jamie, or Buddy, or Linda?

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yes.

Boardmember Sullivan: So that should be listed as another organization that you need to come under.

Under D.2, which is project operation, there was a section regarding excavating mining. I know you're not doing any mining here, but there's quite a bit of cut. I'll get to that later and that, most likely, will be a fair amount of fill that will be removed from the site. So that should be looked at and we should understand it.

I think the second point I found in looking at the project operation was really thinking about the discussions we've had over many applications and many options that we've seen from this developer and owner: the need to understand the traffic implications. We've all talked about this being a difficult site; we're close to a very hill street, in Washington; Warburton's a nightmare sometimes to drive on because of speed and also because of the lack of visibility because of the parking. So my recommendation and suggestion, Jamie, is that you potentially hire someone to look at the traffic implications at both of the driveways just because of the complexity of this. I know we've talked about it, but just understanding the width's right, or the radius is right. Just so we can really be comfortable that this'll be a safe place, going forward.

And, of course, at some point we're going to most likely like to have the Town Engineer take a look at this and help us with any kind of review of the engineering drawings.

The last comment, I think, is ... well, those are the two big ones, dealing with the excavation and understanding the traffic. I think that would be very useful for us to suggest that, of course, for the Village. Just looking at the drawings, what I saw mainly were, potentially, the things that were variations of things: building, coverage – this is the zoning table – which we've talked about; maximum curbcut, which is something that is exceeded and probably justifiably, based on how the code's written; the rear yard is noncompliant at the existing house – again, it was an existing house that had a side yard there – but, again, that's a small detail; parking in a yard is a concern, as I've expressed in the past; and then also a variance would be the setbacks for parking, as we described.

I saw on C.1, it was a little difficult because the dimensions were actually in the shading. But the dimensions of the parking, as well as the aisle – and this is inside the building – do not meet code. The parking spaces are, if I'm not mistaken, definitely not wide enough, maybe not long enough. And the drive aisle is only 2 feet instead of 25, which we require. I see that as a concern, especially in an enclosed space where visibility is poor, lighting is spotty. So that's just a concern.

There are some issues: the details further in this particular civil set don't gibe with the dimensioning. So that's just something that needs to be straightened out. I looked, out of curiosity ... because the issue at the existing building has concerned me with the parking. I would like ... the fishtail scenario just doesn't make any sense. I don't think that necessarily would be good practice. And, again, I'm concerned about the parking in the yard, especially in the front yard, which is something that's visible for all the neighbors on Washington. I don't think it's a typical type of arrangement, and I'm concerned that that is potentially an unsafe driveway even though you're improving by thinking about not having people back out which is, if that's what people do, even more terrible. We should really try to improve that situation.

And I have to say, looking at C.2, given the construction that's going to be going on towards Warburton, many of the existing trees are in danger. Just starting from the left, you're making a connection to the stormwater. There's going to be some grading that's happening in front of the existing building – I mean, the new building – which looks like it could impede the root zones for those trees as well as the excavation. That's happening on the southern side, for the driveway. I'm concerned with one of the initial reactions. Because looking at your site plan and your presentation last time was that that was really a nice thing to focus on. But I think much of that screen's potentially in jeopardy and should be looked at if that's really the case to try to present it as being something that's being kept.

What I noticed in the ... and this is why I was focused on the elevations of the house to the south was, looking at the grading plan and the kind of swales that were going on between the

southern side of the house and that wall, there are areas where there appears to me to be removal of up to 6 feet of soil. So I'm really concerned that that wall is being undermined. I also saw – in the back, with the new grade line of 90, which is right where your pointer is – there's an incredible amount of soil that's going to be removed. That's a big area of cut. I noted that it really seemed to be done to create a level and consistent way for people in each of the townhouses to be able to walk out onto a backyard. That concerns me in a couple ways. Because at some point, does that area become fenced in down the road? But an extreme amount of soil, even given the excavation for the basement for the parking. So I really think we should maybe talk about that as a border. I just note it, as I think it's a concern.

Also what I saw in looking, we had a lot of issues with the previous plan that involved how the driveway at the southern side of the property was being addressed. I tried to track down the contours, and there's a discrepancy between this plan and what's being shown in the architectural. It appears, looking at this plan, that from the left side of the driveway to the southern property line that that whole area's being brought down to elevation 81. The existing elevation goes from 82 to 84, so I really believe more clarity on exactly what's going on there. Because, again, that whole side is really undergoing a heck of a lot of excavation and there may be other ways that are less obtrusive to accomplish your goals.

Finally, the things I noticed on S.1 – and, again, I mentioned that there was sort of no real indication if there are any patios that are being considered for the townhouses – I'm wondering how the dimensions between the two buildings were developed. I felt that the waste areas under the porches actually were probably not that useful, given the height between the grade and the top of the porches. I don't really know what kind of canister or trash can you can get in underneath there. So I think that should be really thought about. That may be a place for some recycling, but the actual trash might have to go someplace else.

I noted it was very nice to see an elevator in one unit being thought as potentially being accessible to people with mobility challenges. However, I think, taking that forward, it looks like the elevator got folks up to the master bedroom as well as bath, but the rest of the house was not accessible. Especially the powder room on the first floor, that really should be thought about. If someone's in a wheelchair of some type, that would be something that I think you would need to have is restroom facilities that are accessible on both floors.

Again, there were coordination issues between plan elevation bay windows that weren't there. I'm sure things were sort of running and gunning in getting back here so soon, so at some point it would be nice to sort of see everything tied together.

I guess, Jamie, the one final question I had is what we've talked about before, which is principal buildings being on a lot solely to itself. This plan isn't showing the subdivision like we have in the past. I've been frustrated because I haven't ever had the question answered. So, again, my understanding when you went through some of the other iterations was that we were addressing the fact that our code seems to say that there's one principal building per lot.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: No, our code doesn't say that. Our code says one principal use per lot.

Boardmember Sullivan: OK.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You can't have different uses.

Chairman Cameron: But a good question is whether a two-family home and a three-family home ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Multi-family.

Chairman Cameron: ... multi-family home are different uses, and I believe they are.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think I saw that in the code, as you look through the two-family home ...

Chairman Cameron: Yes, 295-18(b).

Boardmember Sullivan: Thank you, sir.

Chairman Cameron: More or less.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yeah, so two-families have to potentially be on their own lot.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Wouldn't residential be residential?

Village Attorney Whitehead: When you and I spoke about this, unfortunately I was not aware that there had been history and that the prior Village Attorney had actually analyzed this and issued an opinion. I only found that out today. Her position had been that a two-family is a different use than a multi-family.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Oh, OK. I have a different recollection of our conversation with the old attorney. But that's OK.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I did check with her this afternoon ...

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: OK, good.

Village Attorney Whitehead: ... and she reaffirmed that.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: OK.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's a little bit of a gray area. You know, residential is residential but, technically, a two-family and a multi-family are two different things.

Chairman Cameron: Different uses.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, I'm glad to know the answer for that question because I've had it for about two years.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, I was advised that Marianne had answered it.

Chairman Cameron: Right, she did.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And I'm trying not to change her answer.

Boardmember Sullivan: Lastly, I put together some stuff for the Board, Jamie. I'd like to discuss it, but I don't know if I should take up time at this point.

Chairman Cameron: Well, why don't we give other people ... even though you're the only one that had large print so maybe ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Just towards the end maybe.

Chairman Cameron: Sure. Bill, do you have anything?

Boardmember O'Reilly: Just to visualize something, what is the height of the existing building in comparison of the height of the proposed buildings? The new building's 40 feet in the description here. The original building which sits along Washington is what height?

Ms. Griffin: This building is 34 feet 9 from the ridge to the grade, and our proposed building is 39 feet 1 from the ridge to the [off-mic] at the side of the building there just under the ridge. This line is the maximum height [off-mic].

Boardmember O'Reilly: And it's proposed that the original building will be ... just on your discussion, is it proposed to be a two-family or a three-family?

Chairman Cameron: Two-family, I understand.

Ms. Griffin: This is two-family. One thing we were trying to do is to have similar floor-to-floor height and similar shape. If you see the arrow here, this is our new building. We're trying to keep the same shape as the ... well, like an 8 in 12 roof, not too shallow, because it gives a more traditional look. But these townhouses have the gable going in the long direction. The building is 48 feet long, so even if you use the same pitch we end up with a higher ridge line. The roof over the two-family house, the gable is parallel with the short direction. Anyway, those were our thoughts for the design of the house. And that's why we end up with a grade to top of ridge height grade, from right and centered with that ridge, up 39 feet 1.

Boardmember O'Reilly: The only other thing I was going to add, like Kathy, the driveway and the parking for the existing building is, I think, a cause for some concern. I look at it each time I drive by and it really doesn't seem like a particularly wide area for the sort of parking which is designed there. I may be wrong, but that's my impression. So I sort of support what Kathy is saying about the design for the parking there, for a two-family house.

Ms. Griffin: Do you want me to respond, or just wait?

Chairman Cameron: You can respond.

Ms. Griffin: OK. Because I wanted to give you a few more thoughts I've had about the parking situation here. Right now, it's like broken pavement and there are cars sort of sitting on the side here. So they are parking here, and they do park straight in. But what we were trying to do is improve it. I looked into, or thought about, how we might put it elsewhere. But the problem is that the grade comes and it's very close to the first floor. There's only a few steps onto the porch on this end. So it was really convenient to come in here and come into the porch and into the building on this end, rather than over on this end. Really, you wouldn't want the driveway too far away, like inside this garage.

So what we thought is that we would really just try to improve that site, really put real paving here but leave a 4-foot space for a plant bed. You know, the setback to a parking area is 5 feet so we're only looking for a variance of 1 foot. We just want enough space to put some plants here, and we want to make sure that there's space for exactly four ... we need four spots. This could be straight in if we prefer, if we wanted to. But we thought there was a

comment about if we divide them maybe it breaks up the asphalt. So we did that. And we also have two big shade trees here we'd like to add.

The reason for the turnaround is because, right now, they have to back out into the street, which is not a very safe condition. So we wanted to make this safer, and we want to cut open the walls. It's a beautiful wall, but just to make it wide enough so you can actually see when you're turning around, see cars coming down the street. I'm not sure who's going to look at that, but in every way we can we're trying to improve this, trying to make it safer. We're trying to make distinct parking spaces and trying to put some greenspace around the parking area.

Chairman Cameron: I was going to point out there was no greenspace on the building side of the parking area, as envisioned now. I actually have a little bit of tenderness about how unsafe those streets are. Because I was coming down Washington about 20 years ago with my three sons in the car going to tennis. This woman ran the light and destroyed our car. I was the only one injured, but the car was totaled. People do go very fast on Warburton going north.

To give you an example, I think, seriously, we should not allow people to come out of the Washington exit and do anything but turn uphill, and for letting people out of the Warburton Avenue anything but going north. It's very unsafe.

Ms. Griffin: I still want to point out, when you do a new curbcut on a county street it goes in front of three different departments at the county. One is highway, and they require a turnaround before you go up. They won't allow you to back out. We're going to need their approval, so they're going to do that kind of scrutiny of this new curbcut.

Chairman Cameron: We're going to comment on it, and I think we commented to them on it, as well. Because there's going to be cars parked right in front of your exit on Warburton, and it's going to be hard to see by those cars. As you come out there, your hood's about to come out and someone's about to go by you at whatever speed they're going by. So that's a concern.

Ms. Griffin: They require that an engineer look at sight lines and really look at that carefully. So we're going to have to submit that.

Chairman Cameron: So going down this end, and I'll pick up some more. Do you have any comments?

Boardmember Bass: I have a number. The attic, is that designed to be usable in the future?

Ms. Griffin: We are leaving it unfinished. And really, we were looking at two choices: flat roof versus a gable roof, really for the aesthetics, but we're leaving it unfinished. There is going to be a door at the bottom of the stairs, which is like any attic. If these owners would like to finish it they'd have to meet New York State code for ceiling heights, they'd have to put a sprinkler system in because you need to have a sprinkler system if you do three floors of wood construction, and they'd have to get a permit for finishing the space.

Boardmember Bass: I'm going to echo, the parking on the east side of the site is extremely awkward. I've played with a couple of different designs, angle parking. I thought that was safer than the rabbit theory, where you would have to dash out to the turnaround. Which is also, we're talking about, a good 30, 35 feet backing straight. As I hit my neighbor's car today, I can't back out straight. I think we all agree there has to be a better parking solution for that. I understand you're improving a bad situation, but there has to be a better solution than what's being proposed.

I found the unit size generous: three-bedrooms 18-hundred square feet, two-bedrooms 12 hundred square feet. I thought that was really appropriate. You didn't speak this time at all to the façade treatment, the cladding. Can you address that in terms of the articulation, both the vertical and the horizontal?

Ms. Griffin: Yes. The idea is that there is a sort of similar theme for all these townhouses, but variations on the theme. They all have porches, but they may have slightly different railing details, slightly different gable and front door details. We may have clapboard on one and then cedar shakes on another, back to clapboard-cedar shakes. That's what I'm showing. I want this to be very subtle because I don't want it to seem too unnatural. But I want to pick up on a lot of the details you would see in a lot of the older homes in Hastings, such as wide trim details around the windows, crown moldings on the gable, on the rake boards, bay windows occasionally here and there. And then probably we'll have a colored stucco at the base of the building, with lattice at the porch areas, the underside of the porches.

Boardmember Bass: Besides the various charts that Kathy mentioned – a chart for variation, a listing of all other required approvals for review – could you also provide an existing proposed tree schedule? That would be helpful.

From the last proposal, I found the waste to the street a question. How will the unit waste get out to the curb? Will I be responsible for taking it out of where you are proposing and bringing it out to the curb? Does Hastings drive into the site? How does that work?

Ms. Griffin: I think we'll get into more detail about that. But one thing I wanted to mention about the space under the porches, there's a step-down so you can get more height under those porches on the plan. Next time, I'm going to find a way to blow up these drawings so you can see more of this detail. But yes, we will think about that. I don't know if it's going to be down the center steps to the sidewalk there, that everybody goes that way, or maybe down through. We actually have a walk next to the driveway. Maybe these few units go down the center walk and maybe the one at the end go down this walk next to the driveway to bring the waste out.

Boardmember Bass: The townhouse is 48 feet deep. What's comparable for the neighborhood? I know you did an analysis on the lot coverage, but did you do a similar analysis of the depth of the buildings?

Ms. Griffin: Well, I actually have designed many townhouses. The ones on Ridge Street are 20 by 40. It was a very tight lot, front to back. There's four townhouses there, as designed. We did four townhouses on 400 Warburton, and they're 21 by 48 – almost identical to this. I just felt this was very comfortable; comfortable because if you want three bedrooms you'll put two on one side and one in the back. In order to get bedrooms that are around 10 feet wide, which isn't very large, you need about 20 feet or 21 feet. I can do a comparison, though, for you if you like of other townhouses in the area.

Boardmember Bass: Well, I'm done.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I do want to say I appreciate the coverage and the density analysis. You know, I'm a little bit confounded. I should go back and revisit Marianne's decision because I guess I have less of a problem with having ... I don't see a multiple use and a double occupancy. I mean, it seems to make a similar use. And I actually think, in this neighborhood, it is a high-density neighborhood and in order to stay within that fabric I appreciate the fact that you're going to build something that's denser. If we can figure out a way to do that I think it would be ... I like that idea. So I guess I will have to think about that a little further.

From what we saw in the past – I wasn't here in February – it's a huge improvement, in my opinion. So I just think it appreciates the architectural texture of the neighborhood. I do think the traffic's going to be a heavy lift for you, though. I think that will be the biggest issue, the driveway. As everybody said, Washington and Warburton is not an easy corner so I think you'll have to look into that a little more.

Boardmember Alligood: I think my comments echo what Kerry said. I even expressed last time that I think the design is a huge improvement over what we saw previous months ago in

previous iterations. I think this area is suited for higher density. I think my fellow Planning Board members pointed out a lot of details that do need to be addressed, so I don't want to minimize them. I think there are ways to address them, but I think overall it's an attractive project. I don't see a big issue with having one building be two-family and one being multi-family. Those are my points.

Chairman Cameron: Well, to go to that one, I think what Marianne is citing and what I had brought up is with a law sense. Whether we don't think it's actually meaningful, it's still a couple of long steps from our reading. So that's the issue.

Boardmember Bass: If the buildings were attached, would they ...

Chairman Cameron: But then we have a problem of 160-foot long building, which gave us also some extra problems.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Or if that was a three-family, not a two-family, it would be the same use; it would be multi-family. That's why it's really whether you consider the two-family and a multi-family different uses, and that was Marianne's position.

Boardmember Alligood: OK, but it's an interpretation of the lot. Let's be clear here. It's an interpretation, and we're saying *if* the use is residential. I understand a precedent has been set by interpreting that way, but it is an interpretation.

Chairman Cameron: I don't know if the word "use" does refer to residential. I think its use is one single-family home, two-family homes, three-family homes and above. So those are the uses.

Boardmember Alligood: I understand that that's how it's being interpreted, but common sense says the use is what you're using it for. And they're both being used for residential. I'm just trying to state the common sense interpretation.

Boardmember Bass: But the cure would just be another variance.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, it's just another variance. That's right.

Boardmember Bass: In New Jersey, we run into the same thing and we attach a small wall so the buildings are technically one structure and we get around that use zoning. It's a silly exercise, but shouldn't tie us up.

Boardmember Alligood: That is my point, Richard. You have to look overall what are we trying to accomplish. I mean, what is that interpretation gaining us?

Chairman Cameron: Well, what we have to accomplish is get the Board of Trustees to change the wording of the law. We didn't write it or interpret it and, however your emotions feel about, it is what it says.

Boardmember Alligood: Jamie, I'm not being emotional about it. I'm trying to say what does that accomplish by looking ... anyway, I will let it go. But that's not an emotional interpretation.

Chairman Cameron: I have a few questions. The first question I have is, what is going to happen in the backyard? I notice all these big padded patio doors, and I assume everyone is going to have their own little backyard. I know Kathy mentioned that, but I'd be curious to know.

Ms. Griffin: We left it open for now. We haven't gotten that far along, but we did develop the backyard so it would be fairly level. There's a retaining wall here because there is a grade drop. But this retaining wall's only 3-1/2 feet high because we did want to create this level area. We haven't decided yet whether there's to be common area or somehow fencing, but I will respond to that by the time we come back.

We were trying to figure out what the setback should be front and back because we have enough room to meet the front yard and rear yard setbacks easily. But I just want to point out that a little building here right now – and it's about 10 feet from the retaining wall – somehow there's big trees fitting between that house and the retaining wall. We set this back just based on a judgment call of what we thought might work and still keep most of these trees. But we can look into that, as well. The idea was to try to keep them because they're so big and they're such an effective visual barrier. And also, this may be a nice buffer for housing that's right along a busy street.

But the back, we're going to put some thought into that and let you know.

Chairman Cameron: Right. One of the good things – and I know we talked about this earlier – is that you did move the building back. And one of the good things about it is that the front door grade is about 10 feet higher than the sidewalk. Then you do have a building which is almost 40 feet high. I think the trees that are presently in front of the building – and a couple other people on the Board have said more or less the same thing – are absolutely critical that we keep those trees. Otherwise, the building will look horrendously tall as seen

from the street. Having them with a reasonable height layer of trees in there is very important.

In that regard, I notice you have all of the water storage area off to the north of the new building. I would like to see, somehow, some of that water make its way over to help irrigate those trees. I know this is supposed to be a retention area, but you also have some water going over there. I may have Buddy disagreeing with me.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It's a ground water system.

Ms. Griffin: Yeah, that's what I was thinking.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah. Anyway, I was just think it's important that we both try to keep as much water as we can on our properties and, secondly, make sure those trees are well irrigated so they don't just go and drop on us after awhile.

When you took the pictures, which you showed us, up and down on William – which is what I'm really focused on, both from 19 William and also from 15 William – what floor did you take those pictures from? I'm curious because they're all three- or four-story buildings. You can get a different perspective if you're farther down in the building instead of higher up. I'm just curious what floors they were taken from.

Ms. Griffin: We had a team working on this and I wasn't the person, so I can find out. I'll find out for you.

Chairman Cameron: It'd be useful to know that.

A number of us did actually have the opportunity to go to 19, and it looks like it's in pretty good shape just from what I saw up there. Three of us went there, and it looked like it's in pretty good shape from all the floors. I'm just more curious about 15, which is farther down the hill and therefore more ducked behind the building too high up.

The other thing, when you first started on this – you weren't actually on it, but when they first started this – we required an escrow from you. We are going to need to do some water, but also maybe perhaps some legal work. So we are going to need ... I think the escrow's still there. I don't know if you guys ...

Andrew Cortese, CCI Properties, LLC: [off-mic] still there, yeah.

Chairman Cameron: But if it's not there, we need one. We need you to put some money in. We'll come up with a number

Village Attorney Whitehead: We'll find out what's still there and let you know if it needs to be replenished.

Mr. Cortese: Absolutely.

Chairman Cameron: Let me see what else I have here. I do think you need a traffic person to look at this thing.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I would suggest on the traffic let the applicant submit a traffic study and then retain somebody to review it.

Chairman Cameron: Yes, that's what we've done in the past.

The other thing is stairs from the garage. As you're looking at where the garbage is going to be kept, it might be an opportunity in the space between two of the buildings actually to have stairs coming from the garage up onto the front patio. Because that would be a very interesting way of getting people quickly onto the front from the garage. Right about there, that would be a neat idea if that worked, as well.

Those were all the comments I have at the present time. So at that point, let me invite comments from anybody in the audience who would like to speak. Yes, if you come up and come to the microphone right there and say your name and address.

Mr. Madris: I've owned my property for 30 years. First, it's really a question for the architect. There's seven units in total, right? We're talking about five and two.

Ms. Griffin: Five.

Mr. Madris: But there's also a two-family, so it's seven units. Of those seven units, how many bedrooms is going to be from the seven units? How many bedrooms in total? Because you mentioned three-bedrooms, two-bedrooms, one-bedroom.

Ms. Griffin: There are four three-bedrooms.

Mr. Madris: Four threes. That's 12, all right.

Ms. Griffin: And one two-bedroom.

Mr. Madris: That's 14.

Ms. Griffin: That's in the five townhouses.

Mr. Madris: That's 14, right?

Ms. Griffin: I am not familiar with your house [off-mic].

Mr. Madris: There's three in two.

Ms. Griffin: [off-mic].

Mr. Cortese: There's three in two three-bedrooms.

Ms. Griffin: There's three bedrooms in each of the ...

Mr. Madris: So that's 20 units – 20 bedrooms, I should say. So how many parking spots do we have for 20 bedrooms on the premises now that you're going to propose?

Ms. Griffin: We have 10 spaces for the five units. The code requires two per unit. We have 10 parking spots, including one handicapped in the garage. That's for the five units because we're required to have two per unit. And then for the two-family house, there's parking for four cars.

Mr. Madris: OK, so that's 14 spots.

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Mr. Madris: OK. My concern is that we're going to have potentially ... there's 20 bedrooms. So these folks could have at least two or three cars in a three-family so it's 20 and you might need up to 20. Then you have visitor parking, there's no visitor parking. So I can't see less than 20 parking spots for this premises. As I said, my tenants – I have a five-family I've owned for 30 years there – we have no parking. There's no parking at all. Sometimes I have trouble renting the apartment because there's no parking for these people. We have the bridge closed now for at least another year.

My biggest problem, I see other issues there for you guys as architects and so forth and the Planning Board. But as someone who lives in the area, my concern is there's just not enough parking for not only the tenants, but these are going to be sold units, right? These are

apartment units, or is this being sold?

Mr. Cortese: They're townhouses.

Mr. Madris: They being sold though? OK, sale. So, you know, I would think ... I have a family, I have a son, he's 16, my wife. So we have three cars right there. So my concern is there's just not enough parking you have available on premises.

And then my other concern right now, Warburton, as you guys said, is so crowded there and so hard to come down and turn. The other concern is that you're going to lose more parking. As you open also on Washington you're going to lose another spot or two, so you're losing more parking. We have not enough parking. I think most people will agree with that. I think you guys would agree. Then we have 20 bedrooms and no guest parking. So I can't see, for 14 units, 14 parking spots is going to be anywhere enough parking for that premises. That's my concern.

Chairman Cameron: Well, the town, Zoning Board, requires a certain amount of parking, and they're meeting the required parking. We do have the power to change that, but in a downward direction. So, really, it's hard to respond to you on that. I think parking is a terrible problem in that area.

Mr. Madris: Getting worse.

Chairman Cameron: It's because most of the buildings don't have parking. But this will have parking. I was looking at the diagram, and maybe I can ask a question. The hatch marks going up Washington, are those hatch marks in existence? Right there, are those hatch marks there now, do you know, or where they came from?

Ms. Griffin: Maybe Andrew would know.

Mr. Cortese: I think they are.

Mr. Madris: I think they are, just between my driveway and the neighbor.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But there's no parking because of the curbcuts.

Mr. Cortese: Yeah, in between.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So you're not losing by widening that driveway.

Mr. Cortese: No, no.

Mr. Madris: So you're saying, sir, that the zoning, right now, they meet the requirement. Only 14 spots is permitted. That's all they need.

Chairman Cameron: Fourteen required.

Mr. Madris: I know it's the code, but it seems very not adequate, you know. I think there's going to be a problem there with parking. And then what's going to happen is, people aren't going to have enough parking. And guests and so forth, where are they going to park? See, we already live here, OK, and we've lived there for 30 years. So this is a new project, but we already own these properties, pay taxes, lived here for years. That's why I'm concerned. I'm not objecting to someone building something. It's just for me and for people in the area – my tenants and so forth – it's just the parking. That's the issue I have. I've seen you address other issues which are concerns. But that, as a tenant in the area and the people that live here, that's our problem.

Thank you, sir. Thank you, everyone.

Chairman Cameron: Anyone else want to speak? Yes.

Jim Metzger, 427 Warburton Avenue: I want to thank the Board for their insightful questions and analysis of the project. I have a few things to add, a few questions to ask as well.

My first question also had to do with the two buildings on the one lot and the fact that there are now two driveways on one lot. There are two parking areas on one lot so it's not just the buildings. There are other things associated with those buildings that we're now adding to the site. As a matter of practical concern, having an entrance off of Warburton Avenue, someone's coming home, it's 4 o'clock in the afternoon, they're pulling into the driveway and someone's leaving to go pick their kid up at soccer practice. Who backs up? Where do you go? That could be a potential problem. Cars trying to enter and exit that one driveway at the same time could be a problem with traffic on Warburton Avenue.

In terms of the variance for lot coverage, I know that other buildings in the area have greater density. I don't know what the code requires for the lot coverage at the moment, what the requirement is. But we should also understand that when those buildings were built originally we allowed much greater density. It's the way buildings were done. And the reason the codes have changed over time is to actually reduce that density. We ran into these issues with townhouses, as Christina knows, on Ridge Street. That was handled in a very

sufficient manner. So I want to make sure that we're not creating a situation here where we're making something worse than it needs to be. Because other things in the neighborhood are already worse than they should be.

It also goes to the issue of the density of the neighborhood. This issue has come up when they were discussing the affordable housing: Oh, it's a high-density neighborhood. I would agree with that in terms of the number of people. But if you take a look at the size of the buildings that are in the neighborhood, the sizes tend to be fairly small, the apartments fairly modest. Here, we're putting in five very large buildings relative to other structures in the neighborhood that accommodate multiple families. If you look at the house just to the south of this project, I believe that's a single-family house. On the other side of William Street, single-family house. Next to that, single-family house.

Then we get to the affordable housing project which, as many of you know, is an area of huge concern in terms of the density of that project. We fortunately were able to get to an area where it seems to work well for the neighborhood, except for one very important concern. Despite the fact that they provided all of the required parking for the affordable housing, that lot is empty, oh, about 75 percent most of the time. Because it's much easier for people to park on Warburton if there's an available spot than it is to go into an area that's going to be more difficult to access. So it creates an issue for those of us in the neighborhood.

People exiting this project on Warburton Avenue, as Christina had said, when the county looks at it they're going to be looking at sight lines. We're not going to lose one parking spot because of that entrance; we're probably going to lose three or four because of the sight lines required on either side of that curbcut. We can ill afford to lose that sort of parking in this neighborhood. I understand there's a possibility that the Village may be looking to put parking meters on the bridge when that construction is done. It's going to create additional pressure in our neighborhood. So it's something I'd like the Board to very carefully consider, how this is going to affect those of us that currently live in the neighborhood.

In terms of the height of the building, I understand, as an architect, why Christina is looking to match the existing building. Given the height of their project and the fact that it's 10 feet above grade, I question whether that roof plane needs to be at the same pitch as the existing adjacent building on the site. It probably could be made a little bit lower, maybe neither here nor there. If the pitch of that roof is made lower it probably would preclude anybody from trying to use the attic space as livable space. Because then you start running into issues with ceiling height, et cetera. This is something the Board should consider. If they're sold and someone wants to turn that into a livable space, are we now potentially adding more bedrooms to an already very dense area.

The side yard setback, I believe Christina said, was 15.5 feet. I assume that that complies with current code. It looks very tight to the existing building, but if it complies I have no issue with that.

Construction on the site, a couple of issues. I believe somebody raised the issue of whether those trees would actually be able to be saved during the construction process. I have a real question in my mind when you're starting to do the level of excavation, the amount of machinery that's going to be moving in and out of that site, whether those trees can be saved. I have to say I love the intention of saving those trees. I believe it's critical to minimizing the visual impact of this project on the neighborhood. I'm not sure they can be saved.

The other thing we need to look at is the retaining wall that's there. That retaining wall matches a retaining wall that's just across the street. I believe there's historic significance to that retaining wall being on that corner. We would want to make sure that that wall is protected at all cost during construction.

Parking requirements for the building. I know it says two parking spots per unit. I was under the impression that parking spots were attributable to the number of bedrooms in the unit. It may be that when you're building a project like this – I haven't looked into a project this size – if it's parking spots per bedroom, they may require additional parking spots than just two per three-bedroom unit. I'd like somebody on the Board to take a look at that.

I believe that's actually what I had to say. All that being said, a couple of things for the developer and for the architect. I don't know how long Warburton Avenue Bridge is going to take to finish. Obviously, if construction were to start on this project in the next, let's say, six months we're going to be having construction on the bridge probably for another year, maybe longer depending upon the kind of winter we have next year. Having construction here, having buses going by this site, trying to move fairly heavy duty equipment on and off the site, could be an issue. I'd like to make sure the developer is aware that there could be issues with trying to build a project this size right now with what's going on in the neighborhood. So we want to make sure that all of that is being looked at and thoughtfully being considered before we get into a situation where we already know buses have gotten stuck trying to go up Washington Avenue. They've had problems making the turn. We want to make sure we keep the neighborhood as safe as possible.

Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: The parking, you brought up 400 Warburton. I mean, you're quite right, that's the problem with part of Warburton. It's easier to go in a front door and park on

the street than it is to go to the parking area. We tried our best, and Christina's been working with us to try to make it more convenient to go into your own parking lot than it is just to park on the street. Now, there's going to be somebody that going to stop ... they have been parking in the street, and that's Straub's because they have cars up and down the street. That's why I suggested earlier that we actually have a staircase going from the basement up to the middle of the ramp there because it would make it even quicker to get up to your place in order to get people not to go and park in the street.

Mr. Metzger: I appreciate that. I wanted to say one thing about Straub because that issue has come up before that Straub parks on the street. The thing I wanted to bring up about that, Straub's a family-owned business, I believe they're in their second generation of ownership. Here I'm defending a commercial concern in a neighborhood that typically doesn't have a lot of commercial. They employ somewhere between eight and ten people. They're very considerate about moving their cars around and trying to keep the driveway open. So while I appreciate what you're saying, that they do utilize public spaces. They're a concern that's vital for the Village and I think it's a really good fit for the neighborhood. So I appreciate your concern.

Chairman Cameron: I just made the comment because it was true, not because I don't think they're terrific.

Mr. Metzger: I totally understand that, Jamie.

Chairman Cameron: I've used them for 25 years, and if you actually want to be able to walk to the station that's where you get your car repaired – one of the two places.

Yes, please.

Victoria Bugby, 35 Washington Avenue: I live directly across from the site. I think it's a big improvement from what I saw last year. I still think it's too big; I would like to see four units rather than five. I would like to see it not quite so high and not quite so long. My concern, again, is parking. But I think it's a big improvement over what was proposed last year.

Chairman Cameron: Please?

Ms. Travis: I like the design of the building. I think it's a great idea. I don't know how it works economically, but I think maybe one less townhouse might do better with the overall fit of density.

Is there a way to have the parking come in from the Washington driveway into the building and not come in through Warburton? Because that driveway is going to be ... remember, there's tons of kids that are walking up and down that street and it's not just grownups walking by. There's lots of little kids on skateboards that fly down these sidewalks and there's that kind of potential hazard of coming in and out of Warburton. So I don't know whether you looked into coming from the back into a garage.

The other thing is – the one thing that would really alleviate our parking problem – all of the other nice Hastings people who are watching this show who park here and then walk down to Metro-North, if we opened up parking somewhere down on the waterfront we'd alleviate all this extraneous other people parking in our neighborhood to walk down the hill. Thank you.

Chairman Cameron: The woman in the back first.

Danielle Goodman, 445 Warburton Avenue: I'm new to the neighborhood, not new to Hastings, so I don't know what the prior project looked like. But thank you, Jim Metzger, because my thought was although we're a dense neighborhood, slowly but surely every little patch is being filled in. Although we're a dense neighborhood, we're still Hastings. We're not Riverdale, we're not Yonkers. I did spend a little time in Yonkers while we were doing our property deals, and I came right back to Hastings. We love our neighborhood, too, and I think with every patch of green being filled in it's a concern.

One of my questions is, there's more than one project pending. I believe there's another one on Washington, correct? There's building being proposed, townhouses being proposed, on Washington.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, below Warburton.

Ms. Goodman: Right, not far from this. I'm concerned with, do you take into account – does the SEQRA take into account – the other proposal, or is that one not ripe enough? I'm just concerned with the piecemeal – a little here, a little there, a project here, a project there – discoordinated (ph). I know you have no control over that, but can you not take that into account? John's Bar is for sale, the property next door from it is for sale. There's a rumor in our neighborhood that there's going to be nine townhouses. My thought as I was sitting here is, when people present projects and they want to cover that much lot the impulse should be less, not more.

Four townhouses might take care of some of the parking. I also think the loss of parking on Warburton to a driveway is pretty untenable. The Village is considering meters, I hear, on the bridge which is only going to make the parking worse in the neighborhood. Jim is

correct, and I have observed it: any parking that's inconvenient, difficult to get into, people will walk, they'll park on the street. So thank you for your efforts to make the parking below. But to Ms. Sullivan, thank you for noticing that it's tight to get in and out of the lot as designed.

We don't need more cars on the street. Thank you.

Greg Hall, 15 William Street: I'm one of the property owners at this address. My comments are just addressed to view preservation. You refer to a 40-foot height requirement, so I'm guessing an analysis has been made and that's the height you think you're allowed to go up per the local law or zone regulation. From my perspective as a property owner and my perspective being in the building looking out, I just think this is going to take out a good piece of our view, particularly on the first floor and probably, or possibly, into the second floor.

Just as it relates to the design, you refer to it as 2-1/2 stories tall. It seems to me that it's two stories tall – actually it's three stories tall – with just a big old roof. I just wonder why. I understand, from a design perspective, to a degree why you want that window up there and the big old roof. But when you look at the front elevation of it – the other one that you were looking at earlier, where you're looking straight on at the building – all I see is just a big roof. Right there. I just wonder if you want to shrink that a little bit. I think it would help mitigate any view concerns. It just looks massive to me. I look at the building, I see an interestingly designed building. But what I really see is a roof. And I also wonder why you would want to even mess with that if, at the end of the day, in order for anybody to actually use it rather than use it as a storage room – which is valuable – you'd need to, you said, run a sprinkler line. I don't know if you've sprinklered the rest of the building, but if you want to run an individual sprinkler up there, that's no fun.

It's an interesting design, I encourage your development. It's just from a view perspective I'm cautious.

Ms. Griffin: Now, I wonder which is your house. Because we are trying to understand ...

Mr. Hall: It's 15 William Street.

Ms. Griffin: Can you show me which one? [off-mic].

Chairman Cameron: It says "15" on it.

Ms. Griffin: That one right there. The one way for me to really understand how it could

impact the view is to actually get in the house and then take a photograph, then superimpose the building on that. I don't think we were able to do that at your house. Because a lot of the views we got – like if we see, I guess, number one and two views ...

Mr. Hall: Yeah, that's the ...

Ms. Griffin: Could this be your view?

Mr. Hall: Well, it's the gray building on the left. It's not there. Yeah, that one.

Ms. Griffin: This building is 19.

Chairman Cameron: That's 15.

Mr. Hall: That's the third floor.

Ms. Griffin: Right.

Mr. Hall: So if you drop down two floors on that it looks like I'm going to be staring into the back of your soon-to-be-famous roof.

Chairman Cameron: Well, it would be helpful for us if you leave your name and phone number with our Building Inspector here, and then one or more of us on the Planning Board will come over and stare out your windows. Pick a time where you'll let us do it.

Mr. Hall: Sure, sure. We can work that out.

Ms. Griffin: If you don't mind. That's why ...

Chairman Cameron: And also [cross-talk] Christina ...

Ms. Griffin: [cross-talk] ... for me to understand the impact on the view.

Mr. Hall: Sure.

Ms. Griffin: So I'd like to do that, if you don't mind.

Mr. Hall: Good. All right, thank you everyone. Appreciate it.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you.

Ms. Bugby: I just had one more question.

Chairman Cameron: Sure.

Ms. Bugby: As far as the excavation, is that going to be dynamite? Because isn't that rock that's there? What's the surface under the buildings? Isn't that like all marble?

Mr. Cortese: We dug in front actually on the corner of Washington and Warburton, and we went down probably 12 feet and it's all pretty much sand. We had to repair a sewer. We didn't encounter any rock at that point. But we can dig test holes, if needed.

Ms. Bugby: That's my concern with all the older buildings and the stone walls.

Also, the roof line and the attics. Are there firewalls in between and firewalls across the roof? Because we experienced the fire on Warburton, and our buildings had roof particles falling on top of them. I'm just concerned that those are part of the building plan.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, we need to have fire-rated walls between each unit.

Ms. Bugby: And the roofs all the way up.

Mr. Cortese: That's addressed with the New York State fire code.

Ms. Bugby: OK, great.

Chairman Cameron: Any more questions from the group? Any more questions from the Board?

Boardmember Bass: I have two, and one question to the architect. If you were to do a minimum lot size for this property, how many parcels would you be able to get out of it? If you were to cut it up to 1,500 square feet which is, I think, the minimum lot size.

Ms. Griffin: You're saying how many units would fit on this lot?

Boardmember Bass: How many tax lots and how many buildings could fit on this lot if you were to do a minimum lot size subdivision? You don't have to give me the answer ...

Ms. Griffin: If you don't mind, I'll look it up and I'll give it to you next time.

Boardmember Bass: Please. Because the point I'm making is, if you were to do a subdivision every house would have to have a driveway.

Chairman Cameron: Right.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right.

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Boardmember Bass: So I think that information allows us to understand worst case-best case scenario.

Ms. Griffin: Now, I also think when you're trying to look at a higher level of sustainability we want to make the building compact. If you have a single house with a big lot it's eating up a lot of property for one house. Each house has a driveway and walk. I've done a few LEED-certified projects, and I feel this should be the way of the future.

Boardmember Bass: I'm trying to be ... I'm not arguing for this.

Ms. Griffin: We're compact, conserving.

Boardmember Bass: Again, I want it for perspective.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, I will do that.

Boardmember Bass: I fully understand the need for having party walls and sharing space.

Ms. Griffin: I'll get that for you.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'd like to go through ...

Chairman Cameron: We have a few more comments from Kathy, who's marked up these drawings for the changes since the last time.

Boardmember Sullivan: Here's one for Christina and Mr. Cortese, and for yourself.

Fellow Boardmembers, I put this together because I wanted to try to graphically outline some of the thoughts I have had about this project, since you've had it front of us now for many,

many iterations. Because I think some of the Boardmembers might not have been here when we first saw it, I've included, at the beginning, the various plans that we've seen. What I've done is a quick analysis just to kind of keep track. We saw one plan which had two buildings, very similar in some ways to what we're looking at now. A total of 14 units, the existing building was retained.

The new building was 3,360 square feet, three stories, and two flexible parking units. I went and put together a gross square footage, which was basically taking a footprint and multiplying it by the floors. Because that's something we don't really get into in the Village, but it gives you a sense of the volume. The first iteration had 10,000 square feet of gross space, and the average unit size was 840. The next plan came around and the existing building was not retained. There were 13 units; the new building itself was about 5,000 square feet, three stories. These were rental apartments, which was actually interesting: almost 14,700 square feet gross, and the average unit increased to 1,100 square feet.

Before Christina got involved, the last plan we had seen had a total of nine units, the existing building was retained; 10,000 square feet gross, the average unit was 1,500 square feet. So now the plan we have in front of us has a total of seven units. The new building has approximately 5,000 square feet. They're two-story townhouses. There, again, we're back to the same gross square footage as the original plan of 10,000 square feet. Now however, five units, the average is about 2,000 square feet per unit. I would have to say I would consider the attic somewhat ... I would include that as additional space because right now, as it stands, it looks like it's habitable space.

The only reason for going through this is, really, one of my biggest issues has been the bulk of the building on the property. Richard, to your point about dividing a lot up into 1,500 square foot components, it's complicated. This zone is very difficult. And I'm frustrated with it because there's a lot coverage of 15 percent, there's a need for parking, there's a need for open space, there's a minimum width. There are a lot of things going on, and it's been very hard to try to find your way into understanding what a good massing might be on this piece of property. I am still of the opinion that it's too great, and it's been interesting hearing some reactions from the public.

What I did, I was actually inspired by Christina. I realized I never really looked at this piece, this area, from a visual sense and sort of a sense of what might be compatible. The next plan you have is something that's sometimes used to identify a building's relationship to the others and to the street. It's a figure ground study. The first one shows the existing area. I would have gone further in analyzing it, but I just ran out of time and energy to make flat boxes. But what you can start to see is, up and down Washington and along Warburton they're very small houses, you're close together, they're small fronts, they're not that deep. There's an

area which has a lot of massing which is down Washington from Warburton towards the river, and I'd like to just address that with something else. This just gives you a sense of the character and kind of how the buildings relate to the street and to each other.

The next plan shows the proposed building that we're looking at tonight. In my opinion, you can see the massing and it's actually much larger than anything in the area. Despite the efforts articulated as Christina described, by making variations in the front elevations, different roofs and whatnot, just as a mass it really stands out as something quite unique in this area. And that raises a level of concern for me.

The next two things are two aerials from Google Earth. I'm fortunate to have access to some data that we received during the Comprehensive Plan. These are massings of three dimensions that were produced by the Westchester County planning department. What it does, it just shows you a little bit – again, in a three-dimensional form – how this streetscape works and also the area that seemed to be very big and massive potentially as something that would say, well, this building has a home in this area, it's the same kind of massing. You can see how it's actually very much broken up. Their buildings almost touch each other, but they step down towards the river and they're very different in heights and whatnot. I don't think there's a commonality in a three-dimensional form with the buildings' massing as it stands.

The next plan is just another shot along Warburton, just kind of again giving you a sense. And you can kind of see how the property that we're looking at relates almost more to some of the buildings that stand alone on lots by themselves rather than to the townhouse kind of look.

The next one is an answer to one of the questions, which is this is what you can accomplish with the zoning as is. I apologize for the colors being very similar, but there's an existing two-story structure and then the yellow shows an area of four parking spaces. So that would be something that would need to be considered as you looked at the coverage, but that's what you can accomplish on the site. From my perspective, that's very limiting and I'm not sure it's what we want to have happen. This is a developable site if we get it developed wisely.

The next piece is a thought, and I wanted to put this out there because it's what I've had in my head that I've been trying to explain in words. But I wanted it out just for reaction. So what you're looking at is a driveway that leads to parking that's behind the existing building. It's going to be a legitimate size, it has appropriate ways for people to get in and out. Then the mass that you see, which I'm proposing for conversation, is something that is similar in size to the existing house, existing building. I'm not giving a dimension, I'm just showing a possible relation. This, potentially, would give about 25 percent coverage.

And the last drawing shows this mass in the figure ground, which shows, potentially, that it has more of the relationship to the other buildings without overly massing.

So for your consideration and coverage. And if not, thank you for your time.

Boardmember Alligood: Kathy, in this last one that you're showing us now, it would keep it all as one lot, right?

Boardmember Sullivan: You know, I'm agnostic on that issue. I understand it's the law. When we looked at it being subdivided, there were no setbacks and whatnot. To me, that's the one that you draw because you need to draw a line. Then there's discussions about whether there's appropriate spacing for setbacks and whatnot. I'm much more concerned about the massing on this site. I mean, the figure grounds, for me at least as a visual person, it spoke to me that this potentially is oversized for this neighborhood. I don't think the existing zoning is a good zoning for this site. I've struggled with it, it's very restrictive. But I don't think what's happening here ... and what I mentioned, the same ... I mean, the idea of this building has the same volume as our very first volume that we saw. It's 10,000.

So really, in all of our conversations about density, huge improvement in the site plan. Do I have some questions about the grading in that area? You know, interesting concept. And I must give my opinion. I'll take license from the gentleman that talked about the roof. I frankly think a brick building would be more appropriate on this site. It would have more of a relationship to its neighbor, the original building. And I'm very open, I think, to a three-story building because I think there's a lot of precedence in the neighborhood for that. But that's just my personal opinion.

So it's really what it has to be in my mind, but it's not ... I don't think it has the impact on what I'm trying to get across: a potential to look at some other massing that makes more sense for this neighborhood.

Boardmember Alligood: Right. I just want to understand if, even given what we heard tonight, whether this would even be possible for that site.

Boardmember Sullivan: It's no different. I'm just taking this existing building and making it smaller. Some people gave out numbers – four units, three units. I'm interested ... and another thing, too. One of the concepts ... and I think the developer, Mr. Cortese, has been incredibly interesting with the different proposals we've seen. We've seen rental apartments, we've seen duplexes. One of the ones that stays with me, actually, potentially for the site – and I have a bigger issue with bringing in townhouses like this all the time – these are \$800,000 townhouses. You know, this is expensive housing that's being proposed for this

neighborhood.

One of the options that was shown at one point was first floor apartments and the second and third floor townhomes. Now, that's interesting to me because that starts getting a different mix of housing types, which I think we need in our community. But I'm not the developer.

Boardmember O'Reilly: According to what you're saying, being consistent with the zone as it stands they would need to reduce the size of the new building by about 40 percent or 50 percent.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yeah, Bill. What I showed in this one ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: This one.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, that goes over there. The one that is ... let me look for it. This one is the one that shows what is potentially allowed on this site. Because the 15 percent coverage is restricted. You could add, potentially, about 1,000 square feet to the site if you kept to the percent, the lot coverage or the building coverage.

I've brought this up a lot and I don't know how we address it. Sometimes I think we, as a group, want to say this is the direction we want the applicant to go, or if it's just something I've said and it's interesting to hear or interesting for me to say. But I feel like it might be useful at this point – given the number of proposals we've seen from this owner – to be clear whether what's being shown now is acceptable in size, in massing, or if we want to see a reduction and if we want to see a site plan that really resolves the parking for the existing building. Because I don't think you want to keep the massing without really ... if you get that parking to be what it should be, which is a driveway to a lot where four cars can park safely instead of putting parking in the front yard on Washington Avenue.

Chairman Cameron: Well, just the parking issue, I actually haven't seen a better way of dealing with the parking in a new building than putting it underneath the building, assuming we're going to put a building over in that part of the lot. I think the parking next to the old building is unfortunate and occupies too much land space, and I still think there's some tinkering could be done on that. But quite frankly, from my perspective the parking under the building there ... I think they did a good job in getting the driveway to go straight under the building rather than going alongside it, which was a mistake. You know, I don't see how we have all the cars going out on Washington. We have to have some going out on Warburton. I still think the parking out behind the current building is unfortunate, but I don't see how you can drive that parking underneath the new building.

Boardmember Sullivan: Just to be clear, what I'm proposing is that there's a driveway from Washington that goes beside the home in the back and there's four parking spaces. The four parking spaces for the existing building are placed there. I'm not talking about changing how the new building would address parking. Because you're correct, the first plan we saw the whole lot was a parking area. It was all surface lot. So underneath the building's a very nice way to kill two birds with one stone.

Ms. Griffin: Our goal was to get as much greenspace as possible.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, I know. There's been such a focus on the new building it seems this existing building it not being treated properly, especially when it comes to parking.

Ms. Griffin: We know we can turn the parking and bring it around the back, but it just eats it up. That way, I guess you can have a little more greenspace alongside the driveway, but you will have a lot of paved area right in back of the building.

Boardmember Sullivan: No different. You know what? It's the same amount of paved area for the parking spaces and a way for people to get in and out of that safely. And you don't have front yard buildup of parking and a turnaround. I mean, I understand. But, again, that's the focus on trying to maximize what lot is left over to a new development. I'm saying let's stop, let's ... we've talked, we've heard people talk. It's not a good solution, what's being shown for the existing building. I threw out something that works.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Well, I'm going to disagree with Kathy on this. I do not think a parking pad behind the house ... I would prefer more greenspace. I think it's not an ideal parking situation here right now. I think you've proposed something, I think it could still be looked at. But my idea would not be ... I don't mind that cars are parked on the side of the building. There's all sorts of parking situations around Hastings.

Ms. Griffin: Well, the way this is laid out it's like there's one unit on one side, one on the other. So we put the parking on this side. This person on the ground floor level, they'll be looking right into the parking area.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Just ... I don't like that.

Ms. Griffin: There's an exit out from, I think, the kitchen ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I think there are ways that it could be ...

Ms. Griffin: ... back of each of these.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: ... looked at, improved upon, and be safe. But I don't necessarily think it needs a pad all the way in the back.

Ms. Griffin: Well, we'll think about all these ideas. I really appreciate all the thoughts that you've given us and all the ideas that Kathy's put together.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, I'd like the Board to ... you know, I'm going to say frankly I'm kind of tired of yelling about the bulk. So, I mean, do we want to vote on it yea-nay if you're comfortable with this bulk and massing? I would just appreciate some kind of clarify and sort of direction because I'll bring it up again and again and again. And if people don't agree with it, I won't. But I feel like I have to and it's my responsibility to bring it up. I really don't want to anymore unless there's some agreement. Because we've seen four different proposals and, like I mentioned, they're back with the very same massing that it had in the beginning.

Boardmember Bass: I'm uncomfortable voting on the massing right now because there's still so many open-ended issues. We may have to see another iteration of the plan, both in terms of the massing, of the parking solution, some of the other things we've raised tonight. I think it's premature to take a vote on the issue before versus five units or three units versus five and ... I'm not sure I'm ready. I hear your concern and I'm not dismissing it.

Boardmember Sullivan: Oh, I understand.

Boardmember Bass: But I think the architect has a lot of homework to do.

Mr. Madris: My question is, we talked about the parking and driving out on Warburton Avenue, and the site and being able to see, and turning both ways, and danger to children, to pedestrians and so forth. If they were to approve the plan that we're talking about now, pulling out on Warburton, you said this is a county road. So does the county have to get ... how do they involve themselves with this now? How does that work?

Chairman Cameron: This'll be referred to the county, who will come and look at this from a safety point of view. And we're not there either because we are also going to get somebody. They're going to have their traffic person come in, and then we're going to have a traffic person review what the traffic person says.

Mr. Madris: OK.

Chairman Cameron: So we have all that going on.

Mr. Madris: OK.

Chairman Cameron: So we have all that going on. And I did raise the point whether they should be able to turn left out of their driveway or ...

Mr. Madris: People coming down there so fast day and night, you try to go out there, easy to have an accident.

Chairman Cameron: I know all about it.

Mr. Madris: OK, thank you.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: The project gets sent to county planning, as well.

Chairman Cameron: You know, the Board of Trustees did vote a few years ago to increase downtown density. So they actually indicated they were in favor of more density in the downtown area and, actually, that's where towns are going. I know it's painful for people without parking spots, but a lot of these people who live in these two buildings – however many cars they may have – may never take them out of the building on a day-by-day basis. They just walk down to the hill to the train and go into the city; a bunch of them – not all of them, but a bunch of them – so we may see less traffic than we think. We're going to learn something about that as we go forward.

But I think what we've got in front of us, what Kathy has revealed, has happened through good architectural design. That we've managed to have buildings that look smaller but they're just as big as some of the reiterations. Somebody paid a wonderful compliment to an architect, and said, "Gee, your building's much bigger inside than it looks like from the outside." That's an ultimate compliment. I'm not an architect, but I think that's the ultimate.

So we'll see you soon.

Ms. Griffin: OK. Thank you so much.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you.

Mr. Cortese: Thank you, thank you. Good night.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - None

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

VI. OLD BUSINESS - None

VII. ITEMS - None

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting Date – May 21, 2015

IX. ADJOURNMENT