

VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGULAR MEETING
JULY 13, 2004

A Regular Meeting was held by the Board of Trustees on Tuesday, July 13, 2004 at 8:10 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

PRESENT: Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr., Trustee Michael Holdstein, Trustee Bruce Jennings, Trustee Marjorie Apel, Trustee Peter Swiderski, Village Manager Neil P. Hess, Deputy Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Clerk Susan Maggiotto.

CITIZENS: Twenty-seven (27).

PRESENTATION - PILOT for 422 Warburton Avenue

Mayor Kinnally: Our first order of business is a presentation of the PILOT- payment in lieu of taxes- for 422 Warburton Avenue. Eric Anderson is here.

Eric Anderson, A&F Commercial Builders, LLC: We are here this evening as we were last year regarding a PILOT, which is necessary for our financing for the affordable housing project. The project cannot not be financed without a significant reduction in the tax burden. We are asking each of the taxing authorities, from the school board to the Village to the Town to the County to endorse this PILOT so that our financing can go forward.

The financing depends upon a New York State housing finance agency bond. The Bank of New York has reviewed the numbers and has agreed to issue a term sheet based on them. The housing finance agency has not finally signed off on these numbers, but we are optimistic that they will agree that this PILOT is sufficient for the security they will need in the property. Westchester County, which is looking to provide a series of soft loans and grants to the project, has seen the numbers and seems okay with them.

Mayor Kinnally: We have, in the past, used a local consultant to give us information in connection with PILOTs, and we are doing the same this time. We forwarded the documents to him, and we will await his report. The Board will rely, in part, on that, and do its own analysis, and ask some questions.

Trustee Swiderski: Is this a PILOT request for the affordable housing units, and regular taxes will be made by the four market rate units, or is it a PILOT request for the whole complex?

Mr. Anderson: Part of the problem is that there have been so many iterations of the proposal that sometimes we trail what is the current one. Currently the 14 units being proposed are all affordable. The sense is, and there is certainly an argument here, that the tax burden that these units would pay, given their limited income potential, would be somewhere between \$1,000 and \$2,300 per unit per year. We are asking for a waiver of that tax for the first period of the financing, and then we would ramp up to close to a full payment over the course of the first 30 or 35 years of the project.

Village Manager Hess: The Board had previously endorsed the PILOT payment on this project without any specific amount. I assume we can do that again without a specific amount while we await the report. I have also asked the town and the school to let us know their feelings before the final figures are agreed upon.

Sue Smith, Chair, Affordable Housing Committee: It would be beneficial to have all the involved agencies sit down together and get everybody on the same page.

Mayor Kinnally: I agree. I think it might be more beneficial and a better use of everybody's time if we have a sense of where they are going and the numbers.

Mr. Anderson: Today Westchester County asked that we secure a resolution from the Trustees at your August meeting in support of a series of grants that we are working diligently on with the county. They want your blessing as part of that process. We hope that we would be ready to start construction on this site sometime in September, so the August meeting for us is a very important one.

Mayor Kinnally: We will address those issues, and deal with the other layers of governments, and look forward to having this on for at least a discussion if not an action item at our meeting August 17.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On MOTION of Trustee Jennings, SECONDED by Trustee Swiderski with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Public Hearing of June 8, 2004 were approved as presented.

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Apel with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Public Hearing of June 8, 2004 were approved as presented.

Trustee Holdstein: Page 15, at the bottom: a 10% give back, not feedback.

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Apel with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 8, 2004 were approved as amended.

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Jennings with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 22, 2004 were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF WARRANTS

On MOTION of Trustee Apel, SECONDED by Trustee Swiderski with a voice vote of all in favor, the following Warrants were approved:

Multi-Fund No. 9-2004-05 \$ 5,031.80
Multi-Fund No. 10-2004-05 \$ 8,967.42
Multi-Fund No. 11-2004-05 \$109,548.38

56:04 SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING - ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT

Village Manager Hess: You received a letter from Peter Paden representing A&F proposing a text amendment to the Village zoning code. We should refer this to the planning and zoning boards.

Trustee Apel: Would this change affect the LI zone?

Deputy Village Attorney Stecich: It would affect any district that also permitted mixed-use buildings, which would be the LI and the two new districts created downtown.

Trustee Holdstein: So that would affect the MUPDD.

Deputy Village Attorney Stecich: No, because the MUPDD uses a different term. It is mixed-use residential building and is defined separately. So it would not affect that.

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Swiderski the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

RESOLVED: that the Mayor and Board of Trustees schedule a Public Hearing for Tuesday, September 14, 2004 to consider the advisability of adopting Proposed Local Law No. 7 amending the Code of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson §295-5 Definitions–Mixed-Use

Building, and refer same to Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals for advisory reports.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Michael Holdstein	X	
Trustee Bruce Jennings	X	
Trustee Marjorie Apel	X	
Trustee Peter Swiderski	X	
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X	

57:04 AWARD OF BID STREET RESURFACING

Village Manager Hess: As part of the budget review there was a recommendation to start a multi-year, aggressive street resurfacing program. This would be the first year, spending almost \$500,000. However, the only amount to be bonded is \$181,765, which is less than the \$200,000 I recommended in the first year. It is being funded by \$75,000 budgeted in the general fund; CHIPS money from the state, \$243,174.23; and the bond proceeds of \$181,765.37. The Board had seen the list previously, and added Ravensdale Road from Farragut to 9-A, the pool road, the pool parking lot.

The other streets that are part of this program: High Street from Farragut Parkway to Broadway; Prince Street; High Street to Green Street; Cedar Street from Hudson to Bevers Street; Aqueduct Lane from Washington Avenue to Division; Williams Street from Aqueduct Lane to Warburton Avenue; Division Street from Aqueduct Lane to Warburton Avenue; Marble Terrace; Division Street to dead end; Burnside Drive to dead end of Farragut Avenue; Nichols Drive, Rosedale Avenue to dead end; Rosedale Avenue; both sides of Mt. Hope Boulevard; Jefferson Avenue, Mt. Hope Boulevard to Cochrane Avenue; Fairmont Avenue, Lefurgy to Lincoln Avenue; Lefurgy Avenue, Mt. Hope Boulevard to Edgewood Avenue; Overlook Road from Mt. Hope Boulevard to the dead end.

Trustee Holdstein: What do we know about Peckham in terms of their quality of work?

Village Manager Hess: Peckham does quite a bit of work throughout Westchester. County Asphalt no longer does street resurfacing.

Trustee Holdstein: Is that somebody that we had used before?

Village Manager Hess: For many years, from Tarrytown.

Trustee Holdstein: Are we allowed to inquire of other villages?

Village Manager Hess: Definitely.

Trustee Holdstein: If we discover that some other village was not happy with the work, do we have to accept this low bid?

Village Manager Hess: Peckham has a good reputation. We had Columbus many years ago and were not pleased with their work.

Trustee Swiderski: Given the startling news from Eric that he may begin work on that piece of property as soon as September, could we wait until after the construction to do Division?

Village Manager Hess: We could switch it with another street that we would do next year.

On MOTION of , SECONDED by the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

RESOLVED: that the Mayor and Board of Trustees award the bid for street resurfacing to Peckham Road Corp., Carmel, New York as follows:

Top:	\$66.70/ton
Milling:	\$4.95/sq. yd.
Manholes:	\$450.00 each
Binder:	\$67.60/ton

For a total cost of \$499,939.60 to be paid from general fund (\$75,000), Consolidated Highway Improvement Fund (\$243,174.23), and bond proceeds (\$181,765.37).

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Michael Holdstein	X	
Trustee Bruce Jennings	X	
Trustee Marjorie Apel	X	
Trustee Peter Swiderski	X	
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X	

58:04 AWARD OF BID PRESSED COLORED CONCRETE DECORATIVE BAND

Village Manager Hess: This is the subcontractor that did Southside Avenue as part of the Southside Avenue project. The company that did the downtown is no longer in business, and I can see why. We went out to bid on this and Concrete Images was the sole bidder. In many areas this is a third of what is being charged on other downtown projects. These people normally sub through other contractors, and while they may charge other contractors this price the contractor would charge the municipality twice that amount on a square-foot basis. So it is an extremely good price. We have funding available of \$61,000 to cover this expected cost, in the neighborhood of \$57,000, and we recommend its approval.

Trustee Apel: Are they bonded? If we should have a problem, we would be able to get our money back, or we should not have the same problem as this.

Village Manager Hess: They are bonded. Do not even compare it to what was done in the downtown before. If you look at Southside Avenue, if you look by the train station, they are the ones who did the work and they did excellent work.

Trustee Apel: I just want to make sure that, if there is a problem, which there should not be, we can recover our money.

Village Manager Hess: Sure. Or they do not get paid.

Trustee Apel: How long do we wait before they get paid?

Village Manager Hess: Usually they submit progress payments as they proceed, on a square-foot basis.

Mayor Kinnally: But that is not to say that if two years down the road the project deteriorates and they go out of business, that we are going to have a fund of money against which to...

Village Manager Hess: Take a look at this project down here. It is three or four years old now. They did the center island in front of the train station with Bomanite, which trucks and cars go over, and that has stood up very well.

Trustee Apel: Regardless of that, I want to make sure we are protected; what is the guarantee point that you are allowed to go after somebody if it falls apart?

Village Manager Hess: You have a performance bond for the term of the contract. But we do not have a guarantee bond that something is going to last forever.

Mayor Kinnally: Is there a warranty on this?

Village Clerk Maggiotto: I believe there is. I will find out.

Mayor Kinnally: But the warrant is only as good as they are.

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Jennings the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

RESOLVED: that the Mayor and Board of Trustees award the bid for Pressed Colored Concrete Decorative Band to Concrete Images In Bomanite Corp., Thornwood, New York as follows:

5" thick: \$8.00/sq. ft.
7" thick: \$8.75/sq. ft.
Demolition: \$3.50/sq. ft.

To be paid from bond proceeds.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Michael Holdstein	X	
Trustee Bruce Jennings	X	
Trustee Marjorie Apel	X	
Trustee Peter Swiderski	Abstain	
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X	

59:04 APPROVAL OF SALE 1977 MACK PUMPER TRUCK

Village Manager Hess: The Board had authorized that we go out to public bid on the '77 Mack pumper which is being replaced at Uniontown. The only bidder was AutoPartStores of America, and the fire chiefs have recommended the sale. We expect the new truck in August.

On MOTION of Trustee Apel, SECONDED by Trustee Holdstein the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

RESOLVED: that the Mayor and Board of Trustees accept the bid of AutoPartStores of America to purchase the 1977 Mack Pumper Truck in the amount of \$6000.00.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Michael Holdstein	X	
Trustee Bruce Jennings	X	
Trustee Marjorie Apel	X	
Trustee Peter Swiderski	X	
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X	

60:04 REJECTION OF BID BOULANGER PLAZA WALL RENOVATION

Village Manager Hess: We were disappointed with the bids on the Boulanger Plaza wall renovation. I forwarded to the Board a report from Christina Griffin which lays out three options that she is going to deal with before a presentation either at a work session or at the August 17 meeting. I asked her to provide pictures to the Board of what those options would look like. The bids were over twice the pre-bid estimate of 255, 260 or so. We are recommending rejection of these bids.

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Swiderski the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

WHEREAS, sealed bids for the Boulanger Plaza Wall Renovation were received and opened on July 6, 2004 in the office of the Village Clerk, and

WHEREAS, base bids were submitted as follows:
Transit Construction, Yonkers, NY \$1,044,069
Xavier Contracting, Scarsdale, NY \$ 652,600,
now therefore be it

RESOLVED: that the Mayor and Board of Trustees authorize the Village Manager to reject the bids received on July 6, 2004 for the Boulanger Plaza Wall Renovation.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
-----------------------	------------	------------

Trustee Michael Holdstein	X
Trustee Bruce Jennings	X
Trustee Marjorie Apel	X
Trustee Peter Swiderski	X
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X

61:04 TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND PEDESTRIAN ENHANCEMENTS GRANT FUNDING APPROVAL

Village Manager Hess: This is the walkable communities program that we have talked about. The resolution is from New York State and will be part of the grant agreement. We want to move forward on this, so we can begin the RFP process for an outside consultant.

On MOTION of Trustee Apel, SECONDED by Trustee Swiderski the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

WHEREAS, the Transportation Plan and Pedestrian Enhancements for Hastings-on-Hudson P.I.N. P108-73-881 (the “Project”) is eligible for funding under Title 23 U.S. Code, as amended, that calls for the apportionment of the costs of such program to be borne at the ratio of 80% federal funds and 20% non-federal funds; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson desires to advance the above Project by making a commitment of 100% of the federal and non-federal share of the costs of the Transportation Plan and Pedestrian Enhancements for Hastings-on-Hudson, now therefore be it

RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson hereby approves the above-subject Project; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson hereby authorizes the Village Manager to pay in the first instance 100% of the federal and non-federal share of the cost of \$50,000.00 for the Project or portions thereof; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the sum of \$50,000.00 is hereby appropriated pursuant to this Resolution and made available to cover the cost of participation in the above phase of the Project; and be it further

RESOLVED: that in the event the full federal and non-federal share costs of the Project exceeds the amount appropriated above, the Board of Trustees of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson shall convene as soon as possible to appropriate said excess amount immediately upon the notification by the New York State Department of Transportation thereof, and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Village Manager of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson be and is hereby authorized to execute all necessary agreements, certifications or reimbursement requests for federal aid on behalf of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson with the New York State Department of Transportation in connection with the advancement or approval of the Project and providing for the administration of the Project and the municipality's first instance funding of Project costs and permanent funding of the local share of federal-aid-eligible Project costs and all Project costs within appropriations therefore that are not so eligible, and be it further

RESOLVED: that a certified copy of this resolution be filed with the New York State Commissioner of Transportation by attaching it to any necessary agreement in connection with the Project, and be it further

RESOLVED: that this resolution shall take effect immediately.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Michael Holdstein	X	
Trustee Bruce Jennings	X	
Trustee Marjorie Apel	X	
Trustee Peter Swiderski	X	
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X	

62:04 INVESTMENT POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

Village Manager Hess: You have a copy of a memo to me from Susan regarding the investment policy. During the state audit they noticed that CLASS was not within our

approved investment policies. They suggested that we modify the investment policy. This would allow us to continue using CLASS for investment purposes.

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Jennings the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

RESOLVED: that the Mayor and Board of Trustees amend the Village Investment Policies and Guidelines to reflect the Village's participation in MBIA-Cooperative Liquid Assets Securities System (CLASS) as per the investment agreement with MBIA-CLASS approved by the Board of Trustees on April 19, 1994.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Michael Holdstein	X	
Trustee Bruce Jennings	X	
Trustee Marjorie Apel	X	
Trustee Peter Swiderski	X	
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X	

63:04 RESPONSE TO NEW YORK STATE AUDIT REPORT

Village Manager Hess: This will be posted on our Website and we will send out an e-mail with a link. Under general municipal law, after a state audit a municipality has to develop written responses and a corrective action plan. There were only four comments in the audit, which is currently on our Website. The corrective action plan addresses the comments and recommendations that the state made. Our responses are as follows:

A. Claims processing: 1) All operating departments have been provided with the audit findings and have been directed to comply with the Village procurement policy. Greater monitoring of purchasing activities will be accomplished through the finance department. 2) Copies of the procurement policy have been provided to all departments. 3) A written agreement for professional services has been completed for transcription services, and is currently in negotiation for legal services. 4) Current procedures for processing and approving claims for payment is under evaluation, and will be corrected, if necessary, by September 30, 2004.

B. Cash investments: the Village investment policy has been modified to allow the cooperative investment pools.

C. Fixed assets: the Village retained Maximus, Inc. to undertake a fixed asset inventory pursuant to the requirements of GASB-34. The inventory will be fully implemented in 2005, which is the date that we have to comply with GASB.

D. Pool fund deficit: the Village was aware that a deficit would be created in the pool fund due to a necessary renovation project. The project was completed, and the pool opened on June 25, 2004. The deficit of this self-sustaining fund will be eliminated over a two-year period ending in September, 2005.

Mayor Kinnally: Mr. Hess, I commend you and the staff for the response to the audit report, and the fact that the audit report was as positive and clean as it was. When the state comes down, it is a big investment of staff time and I thank them for doing that. It is a clean bill of health for us.

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Jennings the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

RESOLVED: that the Mayor and Board of Trustees approve the Corrective Action Plan and Written Responses dated July 9, 2004 to the New York State Audit Report #2004M-14 as attached.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Michael Holdstein	X	
Trustee Bruce Jennings	X	
Trustee Marjorie Apel	X	
Trustee Peter Swiderski	X	
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X	

VILLAGE MANAGER'S REPORT

Village Manager Hess: I updated the Board on everything in an e-mail this afternoon, and I will defer to Board discussion and comments for this evening.

BOARD DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS

1. Update on the Waterfront

Mayor Kinnally: I am trying to schedule a meeting with ARCO and their representatives to move forward with the issue of the public space that is to be given to the Village, and we are also monitoring where things stand with the New York State DEC as far as their approval of the cleanup plan. I hope to have a substantial progress report at our September 14 meeting.

2. Mixed-Use Planned Development District and Rezoning - LI District on 9-A

Village Manager Hess: At our last meeting it was decided that we would defer further discussion of the MUPDD to this meeting where we could have Marianne Stecich present, as well as Angie Witkowski and members of the Planning Board. We received some written comments from Trustees. Does the Board want to consider Local Law No. 5? You have had the public hearing, but do you want to consider this concept? If yes, would the Board like to modify it? If not, then we need to schedule a date for consideration.

Mayor Kinnally: I will open it up to the Board on the issue of whether or not you think the MUPDD approach is a good one and should be pursued without regard to any particulars.

Trustee Holdstein: I had concerns within the document and wanted to have a work session with the Village Board and the Planning Board, not in this forum, but where we could sit around a table and discuss how we got to this particular proposal.

Village Manager Hess: That is number two. First, are you interested in the two-tier idea: having a concept plan come to the Board of Trustees for approval and then referral to the Planning Board for site plan, as opposed to the Planning Board being the initial step going through a number of things for, let us say, a rezoning, and maybe SEQRA? If you like the concept you would refer it to the Planning Board, or you could deny the concept.

Trustee Holdstein: I think that I am in favor of the overall concept. But I still want to sit with the Planning Board and go through how they came up with this document. I can live with the beginnings of the concept, but there are a lot of questions as to how we arrived at it.

Mayor Kinnally: You are saying you will consider the concept and then we will fine-tune.

Trustee Holdstein: Absolutely.

Trustee Jennings: I am willing to consider the concept. I am intrigued by the idea that there is no as-of-right permission. This process gives us more flexibility. It is more politically accountable, and it is fairer and more efficient from the point of view of the developers and others in the process. I am sympathetic to the argument that we have a lot on our plate, and

why should the Board of Trustees be taking on a responsibility which might be seen as within the technical expertise of the Planning Board? Although that argument has some force, after watching a number of these projects debated in the community over the years I feel that we are not encroaching on decisions that are primarily areas of expertise, but are going to be dealing with judgments that are essentially political in nature; it is appropriate that elected people make those sorts of judgments. So I do favor this concept.

Trustee Apel: There have been problems over the years with projects going back and forth between the two boards. Anything that we can do to make this process more palatable to the community and to the developer, so we are working together and it does not take three or four years and lots of money, would be helpful. But it is an issue that should be discussed outside this particular zone. It is an issue for all of our zoning.

Mayor Kinnally: But back to the issue before us, are you in favor of the MUPDD?

Trustee Apel: I am in favor of looking at it and discussing it.

Trustee Swiderski: I am concerned about the burden this places on the Board of Trustees. What would this require of the Board in terms of public notice, number of meetings, number of opportunities for the public to speak, and decision? Is there a minimum, legally-mandated amount we have to do?

Deputy Village Attorney Stecich: There would not be any legally mandated minimum. The Board would hold a public hearing on the concept plan, because the concept plan provides the specific zoning for that district, so it is like enacting a zoning amendment. There has to be only one public hearing.

Trustee Swiderski: The Board would have to go through the SEQRA procedure, or would that be kicked down to the Planning Board?

Deputy Village Attorney Stecich: If the Board of Trustees did not want to be lead agency they would not have to be, and maybe the Planning Board would declare its intent. I imagine the boards would come to some agreement on that.

Trustee Swiderski: My concern is entirely the burden it places on the Board. Assuming that the burden is not too extravagant, the idea has merit and I would be interested.

Mayor Kinnally: I, too, think it is something worth looking at. I am sensitive to the issue of adding too many items to the Board. Maybe there is a way of streamlining, or coordinating,

the whole process better. The public has the same right of input whether it is before the Board of Trustees or the Planning Board or the Zoning Board of Appeals, because everybody has an opportunity to speak. This affords us an opportunity to deal with these difficult projects in a more global and more expeditious fashion. I think we should pursue it.

Mary Jane Shimsky, 35 Ashley Road: Would the concept be voted on before the formal environmental review process kicked in? That is a key question because there may be times where it is difficult to pass on a process before you see the implications of it as fleshed out in the environmental review.

Mayor Kinnally: But we are not getting into fine-tuning, just whether we want to pursue this issue. We will move to the second point, concerns regarding the proposed local law.

Trustee Holdstein: There are several specifics that I am very uncomfortable with. Number 7, Hotels or Motels: I would have that removed immediately. All one has to do is look at the hotels and motels in Ardsley to know that nobody in this community wants a similar use on that site. There is some vagueness on units per acre, and I would make it more specific, at six, and bedrooms per to 2. There were some open-ended dash numbers there, and I would rather be on the smaller side. It states having retail that would have perishables. Perishables and the removal of that kind of garbage, near the Saw Mill River and that open land, invites additional critters, and is a bad idea. Rotted fruit and vegetables in a dumpster invites the kind of stuff on that property that I do not think we want.

Mayor Kinnally: And the people who live there who throw out rotted peaches, pears and everything in dumpsters, what are we going to do with them?

Trustee Holdstein: We do the best we can and do not want to make it worse. If we can control what we want on the site, we should try to limit potential negative effects. I do not like the entire list of accessory uses. We list dentist and physician, yet earlier we discussed not having medical office use. That seems to be in conflict with the opening paragraphs.

Deputy Village Attorney Stecich: No, what you cannot have is a set of offices for doctors. But these uses were taken from the home occupations allowed in the residential districts throughout the Village. This is allowed in all residential districts throughout the Village.

Trustee Holdstein: I think we ought to look at that. I do not like a lot of what was written about signage. It allowed for signage that was going to be rather obnoxious as you are driving down 9-A. I would like to be much more restrictive. We ought to consider the potential of cutting the site in half. We say that it has to be developed in its entirety by one

developer, and I think that is a little restrictive. The potential of having two different developers over 3 ½ acres doing something opens avenues for something a little better.

Trustee Jennings: There is a lot of detail which is unnecessary if only because it is redundant with other aspects of the overall review process. I am not sure why some of the other boards and commissions should not be worried about the size of the signage, for example. Why should that be in the zoning text? The more general concern is that I lack a sense of criteria for how to evaluate the suggestions that are made here for things like numbers of bedrooms. I agree with Mike: I need to hear more from the people who have given a lot of thought to this text. What criteria does it follow from? Are these general planning principles that anybody in the field would immediately recognize as good sense? Is this written to conform to a particular project or potential project? I am not sure where this is coming from, and hence I do not know how best to evaluate it.

We should try to get rid of things that are redundant with other parts of the process. Whenever it says that such-and-such will be subject to SEQRA review, that suggests that other things are not subject. Everything is subject to SEQRA review. That type of wording should be looked at carefully and eliminated insofar as it suggests that there are things that will not have to pass muster on specific site plan and specific review by the Planning Board. My support for this is contingent on the belief that all of that will be just as fine-tuned as it is now under the existing zone or under any conceivable zone. This zoning should not water down the site plan review that the Planning Board does. We should be clear that is not either the purpose or the function of this zoning. The projects here are not going to be given an expedited review; they are going to be subject to as rigorous a review as they would be if we kept it LI or any other zone.

Trustee Apel: I want to thank the Planning Board for going through the process and coming up with all these things. But there should be no retail. We had problems before, and retail should be taken out. There should be no residential. Having people living over there is too far at the other end of Hastings. It is going to provide more problems for our Village. We will have people that are, no one likes to use this term, encased. No matter what we say, those people will be a separate group. There will be people whose children will not be going to school with our children but they will be asking for services from our village, and this is not something that I would like to see.

We should look at the LI zone as it is. We remove the retail from it. We separate it from the other zones. And then we decide what additional things we want to see in the LI zone. I do not want hotels and motels. But there are a list of things that could do very well there, and that is what we should be looking at. The LI zone goes all the way down on the waterfront.

We are looking at two areas of property. If we are looking only at 9-A, then we are spot zoning and that would be dangerous. We have to look at what we want in both those areas because they are both LI.

I know you do not care for having doctors and dentists, but there were other things on that list which could be added to the zone, like health clubs. I like the concept of artists' studios, but I do not like the concept of living there. There are professional uses that could be there, and municipal parks and playgrounds, or a bank, or some service establishments. Although I know we do not like having gasoline stations and motor vehicle storage, it is interesting that there are cars there now and nobody sees them but they are there. There should be some special use permits that could be added to that, where someone could get specific permission to do other things. There can be research facilities. If there is a desire by the community not to have the use of animals and other types of research there, then they could be limited.

I do not wish to enact this particular zone. I wish to modify the LI zone, take out the retail and residential, and separate it from layers of other zones. We should separate all the zones from each other so that we are not going to have problems like another request to change the zone which would affect it because it is another layer and they are all piggybacked on each other. I need to know from the lawyer if it is doable to just modify the LI Zone within the time period, because we have been holding off on any development in that area.

Deputy Village Attorney Stecich: That is how this whole process started out. They tried to look at uses that would work in the LI district. It soon became obvious that it is not so much the use as the mix of uses. That was why they came up with this idea. So, is it doable? Yes, it is not hard to come up with a list. But the Planning Board was frustrated in just coming up with a list of uses in the abstract.

Trustee Apel: I understand that process. But we have a moratorium. If we were to reject this, do we have time to come up with something else?

Deputy Village Attorney Stecich: If you decide you are not going to go this, and you want to consider a new local law that modifies the LI district, then whenever the local law is drafted and you set the public hearing on it, you have a *de facto* moratorium that runs for 90 days from calling for the public hearing.

Village Manager Hess: The last extension was 60, and it expires when?

Village Clerk Maggiotto: It was for 60 days from the date of filing, June 29.

Trustee Swiderski: What differentiates this from a regular zone is only the Trustee review. The issue that Mr. Jennings brings up regarding the fact that it still specifies what should appear on that zone is true, but I do not know if it makes any sense to create a zone without some specificity. If you are not providing some guidance to a developer as to what you want to see on that site you leave the site and the developers open to confusion. So I have no trouble with the specifications. I do have a better idea of the logic behind the specifications and what the Planning Board was thinking when they came up with the various uses, and do not have a problem that they came up with the set of uses. I do not think it was driven by anything other than rational analysis.

I have spent a lot of time wondering about this plot of property and what belongs there. I have seen many proposals for that plot, including ones that involve mixed-use involving the Artists' Walk concept, and recent modifications to that concept which are attractive. But I remain deeply skeptical about a residential use for the site. That skepticism does not come from some of the things that are touted. I do not think the impact on traffic is such that we need to fear that like we would the traffic generated by other potential uses. It comes, rather, from the planning principles that we signed on to eight years before I came here, where we saw housing of this density closer to the center of town and not necessarily at the periphery. As seductive as various uses for this property can be involving housing, I have to come back to that principle, swallow the seduction, and say I remain skeptical when it comes to residential use for this site. I do not have the same problem with a hotel. I do not have a problem with limited retail for that site. But virtually everything that involves somebody living there, I do. I wish I could say absolutely not, but I have major reservations and that is where I stand after three years of worrying about this.

Mayor Kinnally: I have had serious reservations about the wisdom of residential on that site because of its isolation. I have had a number of discussions with people privately, with the developer, with the people who are opposed to the concept of any development there, and people in between. I have listened to a number of people here talk both for and against residential. My initial skepticism remains, although I am not as adamant as I was. The issue of isolation and bifurcation of loyalties, people living here and going to school in the Ardsley district, is something that we have to address. But then again, a lot of families do not send their children to the Hastings schools, and somehow or other they seem to be actively involved in the fabric of the Village.

The issue also is the mixed-use concept, because mixed-use seems to soften the traffic impacts. A portion of the traffic will come through the Village. There were concerns about the train traffic. The developer came up with some proposals, but there is a skepticism as to how many people will use a jitney to the train station.

The concept has evolved over a period of time as a result of input from the community. There was no formal report issued by the local citizens group that met with Mr. Nolan last year, but there is a sense coming out of it. A lot of people do not want any residential, but there are also people who would like a vibrant use of this site. Mixed-use is conducive to that.

I am not averse to a hotel or motel. The impact of a hotel on the site is minimal. The issue is who the operator of the hotel or motel is going to be. If we could get a top-flight operator for a moderate-size motel, it would be a plus for the community. It allays concerns about the adverse traffic impacts on our community and the surrounding communities. If you look from Manhattan all the way up to the Tarrytown Hilton on the along the Hudson River, there is not a hotel or motel that is considered first-class. It also feeds into historic Rivertowns. We are trying to get people to come here as a destination to enjoy the communities.

Fifteen hundred square feet of a convenience store is not a big thing. Michael, I do not mean to make light of your concerns but we can deal with that. A convenience store is an accessory use to the site. The people who live there will use it, or people biking along the trail stopping and getting a snack.

All of us would like to see greenspace, but the Village is not going to buy the property. We have talked about what we do not want there; what is it that we would like to see there now and in the future? As it stands now without fine-tuning it, the mixed-use concept is something that I am not ready to abandon. It is well worth continuing a discussion on it.

Trustee Holdstein: I would vehemently disagree that putting in a hotel is okay; it is up to the operator, and the operator may change. When that hotel that you think is so wonderful is there for two years and does not do so well, and then they flip it, and then they flip it again, suddenly that hotel is not the same type of hotel that you originally had. Regarding Bruce's point about being too specific, there are certain areas where it is incumbent upon us to be more specific for the benefit of the Village. Defining it as well as we can benefits the community more and protects us to get what we ultimately want to see there. I do not want to be restricted so that it cannot be properly developed, but we have an opportunity to have some level of control. In villages like Scarsdale they dictate what kind of window you can put in your home, and that would never fly in this village. But there are some examples where we were not more strident in what we wanted to define and we are stuck with some pretty ugly pink and blue awnings in the Village.

Trustee Jennings: I am not advocating that there not be any structure or guidance to developers. I was thinking mostly of section D, the regulations about the accessory uses. It struck me that section may be redundant with other regulations or overly detailed. But

important structure is given by section B and section E, development regulations. Here I do not have any quarrel.

In keeping with the concept plan/site plan distinction, it might not be amiss to have a provision which would permit a future Board to consider a concept plan that might fall outside of the uses that are listed in section B. The disagreement among us is whether or not it is a good approach to think in advance of what we do and do not want in very specific terms, and try to zone so that we get the one and only thing that we want, regardless of whether the owner wants to build it or can build it. That type of zoning is a mistake. It is a misuse of the zoning power and not good public policy.

I do not think we have the ability to get that consensus and stipulate it that tightly. We need to rule out those things that clearly would be inappropriate, and allow for a process of creative negotiation with somebody who can come up with something that might pass muster and be an advantage to the community, and let the zoning foster that rather than shackle it.

Trustee Holdstein: I agree with you. I do not think anybody wants to create a situation that was the one and only. There are certain things that we may as a community be able to agree with, some areas that we can put a framework on it. I am not looking to get this tight, but to get some boundary on it.

Planning Board Member David Hutson, 19 Flower Avenue: What drove our many discussions on the Planning Board was a concern about impacts on this site. This probably has implications for the other large tracts in Hastings. But we are particularly interested in traffic, the financial impacts on schools and villages, the impacts on the downtown, and the aesthetics because it a gateway to the Village. We tried not to pin down uses as much, because when we looked at the individual uses it came down to how big it is in terms of how much traffic it is going to generate and what it is going to look like and what it is going to generate in taxes, and what the likely costs are. That is the way we approached this. So that is why on the one hand we look to flexibility; on the other hand we want to make people feel comfortable because something that is an allowed use has clear limitations.

We did not start particularly invested in residential because it is not the first place you think of where you want to build a house or have an apartment. But when it came time to looking at the impacts from residential, it clearly stood out as good as or better than most of the other possibilities. That is why we put in the limitations. The kind of thing that we are projecting is in keeping with the R-10s and the R-7.5s, which are the surrounding residential areas in the outlying areas as opposed to the density in a downtown. So that is one of the reasons we put

something specific in. It does not make it so dense that it is not in keeping with other residential areas that are further out from the center of the Village.

The only other thing I would say about residential, and you used the term enclaves, it is perfectly legitimate to say we do not want to have people living that far from the center of the Village, or we do not want them isolated, we do not want them going to another school district. It is your judgment to make, so long as you do not use the Vision Plan as the excuse. When Riverpointe was done, we did not have in mind that people should not be out there because it was too far away or it was rather isolated. Likewise, at this site.

In the data that was generated for the development of the Vision Plan, on the committee on population and housing, that site was one of the ones in terms of its potential impacts for housing. So obviously we were considering it not as some enclave inherently. When we wrote no separate enclosed enclaves, we were talking about restricted public access. You could not go on it if you did not live there; you could not drive on it; you could not walk on it; and so on. It is crucial to us in this document that anything that is residential is not an enclave in the sense that there is access. You might even decide that we do not want residential there because there are very few properties left in the Village where you could build commercial spaces, and you may want to reserve the space for that reason. But it is not because the Vision Plan was in any way intended to suggest that site, or any of the more remote sites, could not be used for residential. The things that we talk about in regard to residential in these spaces were having appropriate setbacks. One of the dilemmas had to do with the fact that we were concerned not only about the setback from 9-A, but also the setback from the trailway, which may be more important than 9-A in that case.

We talked about the fact that any new development has to take into account what the trailways encourage and to make sure that it did not interfere with the walkable community.

The Planning Board would be happy to discuss in detail the reasons we got to these. But most of the specifics were arrived at through considerable consideration of the data that applied to those uses. It came down to how much of that use do you want to have, and it has to be limited; we think it is important that there be some specifics in here.

Planning Board Member Patty Speranza, 8 Ridgedell Avenue: What I want to say to you as the Board of Trustees is, welcome to our world. We had exactly the discussion that you are having. Residential will work; no, a hotel is no good because look at Ardsley Acres; we should start with the LI zone and eliminate the uses. This was all part of the process that we, as the Planning Board, went through.

A two-phase process where the concept is agreed upon first is because of the problem that we had in identifying and being able to commit to a specific use on the property. You put an office building up. Well, it depends on what kind of office and how big the office is. If it is too big, then you have a traffic nightmare. Maybe you could have a warehouse or a laboratory. That is fine, but then you have big trucks coming in and do we want big trucks coming in? It is a very difficult site. The debate and discussion can go on for a long time.

It is balance. You have the cemeteries, park land, the trailway, a warehouse, and a lab. It does not have to be in the hands of one developer, but there has to be a plan for the entire property. If someone wants to put housing on it, and someone else wants to put a health club on it, at least in our minds that would be okay. But overall, initially, there has to be one plan for the property which shows that, to show the scale of uses and their interrelationships, and circulation, and maintaining the distance from the trailway and 9-A.

We would love to meet with you and go through how we came up with these things. This is a document made by many, so I am not surprised that there are many different opinions of it from the Board as well.

Planning Board Member Fred Wertz, 423 Farragut Avenue: An informal and frank discussion among all of us would be useful. We ought to talk about the concept in general, particularly if it might apply to other large tracts in the Village, as well as the specifics of this plan. It is a new approach to zoning and we do not fully understand its implications for the Board and what the process will mean for the Village.

This whole thing has to do with tracts that are large and can have multiple uses. A lot of creativity could be put into them. We want to be able to entertain a broad array of possibilities there. We ended up with this concept idea so that whatever is done works as a whole. Whether a particular use is right or not depends on what else is there with it.

The difficulty comes in the tremendous number of variables in setbacks, in aesthetic restrictions, in traffic, and in other functional performance criteria and restrictions. You go through each of these variables and it is like a checklist of uses, do you want this? If it is really objectionable, and there is consensus in the group, then we say no, we do not want that so that is off the list. It is a process of elimination getting rid of uses and implementing setbacks and restrictions that seem important. That is good because it limits the free creativity of developers and lets them know clearly what the Village does not want. That way they do not waste their time and they work within certain parameters.

On the other hand, there is also a tendency not to want to exclude uses too prematurely. Therefore, there is an openness and a very wide opening of parameters in terms of uses that ends up coming out of this process. This MUPDD allows a huge amount of creativity. It will invite developers to imagine very broadly because the possibilities are huge. If it is a process where the developer is motivated to try to maximally develop the site you are going to get some ideas that you may think are too big; then you may reject them. Then they may come back with another concept. You may see a lot of concepts and engage in a process of negotiation that could take a long time.

Some people say, yes, residential; others say no. That is the same debate that would occur if the concept were to be proposed. I agree with those of you who are leery of residential there because of its isolation; because the children will be going to Ardsley schools; because it is far away from the rest of the Village; it does not fit with the context of the other uses in the area. I am also concerned about commercial there. To concentrate the larger-density residential and commercial activity in the center of the Village not to proliferate development, either residential or commercial, at the periphery of the Village is the way to go. Organic links with the Village are important and necessary.

I am also concerned about traffic; residential will bring more traffic into the Village. I resonate with all the objections expressed regarding residential and commercial. That was why I was not able to vote in favor of that proposal on the Planning Board.

Tom Brown, Overlook Road: The Planning Board basically missed the boat. The main issue here is whether you want residential or not. We asked the Planning Board where they got all their figures from. They never investigated it, and it was based on flawed figures from the developer. I hope the first thing you talk about with the Planning Board is where did Turner come up with these things that said residential would be okay. They did a disservice to the people of Hastings by allowing residential to still be in the mix. It is quite clear from all of the mediation that we did in a citizens group that most people in Hastings do not want residential. Any attempt to use this process as something for residential is something that is going to be remembered by the people of Hastings. You should remove immediately residential from the consideration. The reality is residential makes no sense, people do not want it, and if you have any doubt, hold a referendum.

Lorraine Kuhn, Ardsley: There is a chemical plant across the street, Purdue Pharma; a chemical plant up the block at Akzo, with an open spill incident; and a former chemical plant right next door where no cleanup was ever effected. This is not a residential neighborhood. It is zoned properly as light industrial.

Ms. Shimsky: This is an odd conversation because we are talking about a universe of uses when we know full well that there is a specific development proposal here. The current zone and the Turner report say that particular proposal and most of the particulars that we know of at this time are okay. I have done a written submission about the problems in the Turner report and some other issues. The problem is that we Angelinoizing all over this country. You have little nodes which are not connected to anything else except by automobile. One of the reasons that people move to Hastings is because of the unitary village feel. We start building these nodes which are only accessible by car, which are distant from other places, and which are, if not enclaves unto themselves, certainly little clusters away from the center of town. We are encouraging a type of development that people who move here do not want or else they would be moving into other places where they could get bigger houses for less money. I think that residential is inappropriate on this site.

Ann Boaz, 22 Nepperhan: I am not sure I understand why retail is a worse evil than residential. Could someone kindly explain that to me, and why we cannot come up with a more creative, interesting, and imaginative way of dealing with this space?

Tim Vincent, Southgate & Ravensdale: Ravensdale acts as an artery that takes a lot of traffic from 9-A right into town. I live right there and I can tell you that there is already a significant level of traffic on that street. It is troubling, especially when you take into account that there is a lot of pedestrian traffic. There are sidewalks, but during spring and during the winter the sidewalks get much more narrow and it becomes problematic for children and people walking dogs on that road when cars come screaming around those two blind corners.

It sounds to me like you all have taken that into consideration. Traffic seems to be an important issue for you. As a resident and someone who lives there I can tell you it has to be the most important issue for you in your decision. Residential seems to me to be probably the worst decision you can make for that space. Anything that increases traffic on that street is going to be problematic.

Danielle Goodman, 28 Ashley Road: I have been watching carefully proposed development in the surrounding communities, Yonkers in particular, and I am deeply concerned that we keep our buffer. 9-A is our buffer. It is zoned currently as light industrial. If light industrial keeps that property undeveloped for a certain amount of time longer, so be it. It was made clear to me when I appeared before the Yonkers city council that we have no say about what goes on in Yonkers. So please remember we do have a say in Hastings.

I sat through some of the Planning Board meetings. I am aware of the volunteers that serve on that committee and how hard they work. But I was distressed by some of the things I heard, and I wish that you will use your wisdom to keep our buffer zone protected. Do not allow residential or any development there that is not going to benefit the community. We asked questions as citizens, and I do not think I ever heard an answer that was not a conclusion. People asked what was the benefit of changing the zoning law, and I never really heard an answer about what the true benefits to the community would be. I heard platitudes. I heard we are going to have cheaper housing, we are going to get a different mix of people, it will be good for us.

We do not have any guarantees but for what the zoning can guarantee us. I ask you to use your wisdom, and when you balance the benefits look at the risks and the burdens. I never heard a cogent discussion about how residential would affect my taxes.

Elizabeth Felber, 415 Farragut Road: When you are looking at this proposal you need to ask if you are protecting the residents of Hastings that live in the communities off of Ravensdale and, specifically, pedestrians, including children who want to walk to school. My son wants to walk to school and I will not let him because there is no safe place now to cross Ravensdale to get to the neighborhood on the other side by Dan Rile Park. That is because the traffic is so bad now. The cars do not stop at Farragut. They pull into the intersection. I would say it is an accident waiting to happen, but it has already happened. A little boy was hit by a car in front of Amjo's. That is also an area that the traffic is bad in.

Mayor Kinnally: With no further comments, let us talk about when we might be able to meet with the Planning Board.

[Discussion of dates]

We are into September because August too many people are out. So we will pick it up and see what we can do in the beginning of September.

Trustee Holdstein: I would recommend that we do this in the Orr Room where we can sit around the table. I think that would be very conducive.

Planning Board member Speranza: If there has been correspondence among the Board members about this, can we get copies?

Mayor Kinnally: We will make available what we can to you.

Speaker: Is that a private session?

Mayor Kinnally: No, it would be open. But it would be a work session of the boards. I am not saying there would be public input in that session.

3. Tree Pits

Village Manager Hess: One Village resident since our last discussion tripped and fell on one of those tree pits. I have told the superintendent of Public Works to put in bark chips until the Board makes a determination on exactly where we are going.

Mayor Kinnally: What is the timing of the construction of the Bomanite?

Village Clerk Maggiotto: She told me three to four weeks to start.

4. Safety Council Report - School Safety

Village Manager Hess: After discussion and due consideration, the Safety Council recommends the following action: 1) consider banning some parking on the north side of Mt. Hope from School Street to Farragut Avenue; 2) make a drop-off zone on that north side where parking is banned; 3) investigate the possibility of a speed hump installation on Mt. Hope Boulevard between Farragut Avenue and Rosedale.

Items 1 and 2 would require legislation and would require a public hearing. Item 3 could be done without a public hearing after we check with the Village Attorney's office .

Some people wanted to institute this prior to the beginning of school opening. A lot of people are going to be away in August to try to hold a public hearing. So I put it on tonight's agenda to have an initial discussion among the Board members. You could call for a public hearing in September to insure the input of the neighborhood and people from the school.

Trustee Apel: I was at the meeting as the liaison to the Safety Committee. We had asked them to come up with three things. They prioritized what they felt would make the biggest impact and be for the safety of the students.

There was lengthy discussion about whether the spaces would be eliminated all day, or up till 9:00 a.m. I feel no parking until 9:00 a.m. is doable. There would be about 25 parking spots eliminated. So it could have a big impact, mostly on the students because the teachers come early.

The reason behind this is a video that was made by someone standing on top of the school and showing the morning traffic and the drop-off. That area appeared very dangerous, with kids were running between cars. They felt if the concept was tried and we would know, after a certain period of time, whether it was working or not. If it did not work, we would go back to the old way.

Mayor Kinnally: It is a start, but it does not solve the problem. What happens to the people who come up Farragut from the south and turn onto Mt. Hope? What are they going to do to drop the kids off?

Trustee Apel: Over time people learn that the drop-off is the other way. They would have to go around the block.

Mayor Kinnally: All we are trying to do is to ease the congestion in the area. But you may be throwing more traffic through that stop sign than you are now.

Trustee Holdstein: We can try to reroute traffic to turn down Merrill, make a left on Rosedale, go down Rosedale, come out of Rosedale making a left onto Mt. Hope. Now they are on the proper side to pull up, drop their kid at the school, and then come out of Mt. Hope and make a left or a right. It puts some of the traffic coming down Farragut over to Rosedale. You are still going to have some level of congestion coming out of Mt. Hope, but it may be staggered with cars who, like myself, are not dropping anybody and are going through to the stop sign, making a left at Olinda, and going to the train station.

Mayor Kinnally: If you put it on Merrill and Rosedale, those are two streets that can ill afford high-volume traffic.

Trustee Holdstein: The volume of traffic coming to the stop sign includes people like myself going to the train who are dropping children off. That volume is still going to be going straight through on Farragut. I do not know what the numbers are, but pushing some of that volume onto Rosedale might be a little help.

Trustee Apel: There was a lot of discussion on removing the cars on the other side of the street, too. Something that I learned about traffic is that the wider you make the street the more dangerous it is going to be. It is better to make the street narrower because it slows people down; leaving the cars there is better than taking them away. Taking some of the cars and not all the cars, I learned, makes a dent and then people have to pull out into traffic and that causes problems. But if all the cars are missing, they pull forward, they have their own traffic lane. They are on one side dropping their kids off, and the other people coming down

the hill can go past them and they are not involved with the drop-off. It was one suggestion out of all the things. There are so many things that you have to do to make anything better. They said let us try this one thing.

Mayor Kinnally: I agree it is a start. I was looking at the drop-off point in front of the school, parallel to Farragut. The only traffic would be for kids to be dropped off. If you want to isolate the kids from through traffic, that street is probably the best. But it has its built-in problem of where you route the traffic after that because of no left turn..

Trustee Apel: That is not public street parking; the school is the one that has to decide to eliminate the traffic.

Mary Wirth, 335 Mt. Hope Boulevard, School Board Member: That is our property, and we do have something to say about it. Eliminating any parking around the school is really a hardship on the school. The faculty and staff would be displaced, because they are there the first and they would get those spots. The Safety Council ultimately narrowed it down to the one side of the street, eliminating some or all of the parking, knowing that it would be a hardship to not have the parking. But it was with the idea that it would not just be striping and there would be some kind of barricade. This really has to be looked at. We were hoping that the walkable communities would look at the whole picture so it would not be these isolated Band-Aids.

Mayor Kinnally: The walkable community is not going to solve the drop-off problem.

Ms. Wirth: In that program, a lot of it had to do with traffic calming around the school, and some of these very things were talked about at that workshop. But it is not just eliminating the parking. When the road is narrowed it does slow people down. The same amount of people can get through in a calmer fashion, but more single-file. Another thing that was talked about at the Safety Council was that middle school parents tend to not want to drop off their kids in front of the high school. There are a lot of issues.

At the school we talked about if you eliminate parking here you would have to eliminate some there, and maybe ask for another crossing guard, so that we would be creating a two-sided safety zone. Have barricades where people would pull in, those big cones that they have at construction sites, lining them up so that people could come down Mt. Hope to the intersection and not even be part of this drop-off zone on either side.

Mayor Kinnally: So the school is not interested in having the drop-off there?

Ms. Wirth: They already have one there. There is a drop-off that people pull in the front. Do you mean eliminating all the parking there?

Mayor Kinnally: Yes.

Ms. Wirth: But what would that do?

Mayor Kinnally: If you eliminate the parking there you have an unrestricted drop-off zone for kids. You do not have the problem of barricading. It is naturally barricaded. You would only be able to go in there to drop off or pick up kids. You are going to lose parking on any configuration. I am not saying it is the answer. I am just saying, what would the school's reaction to it be?

Ms. Wirth: I can mention it to them as a possibility.

Mayor Kinnally: I suggest we put it on for a resolution at the meeting in August, for a public hearing in September, on whatever we come up with.

Ms. Wirth: I will pass on what was mentioned here, and see.

Trustee Jennings: Part of the problem that is unsolvable comes about because we are thinking of people being dropped off on Mt. Hope. The real danger is the turning in all directions between Mt. Hope and Farragut, which is a very dangerous intersection.

Here is a radical concept. For that crucial half-hour in the morning, how about diverting all the traffic coming down Mt. Hope onto Rosedale and other streets, prohibiting people from turning on to Mt. Hope from Farragut. Make that whole area a drop-off pedestrian area. On Farragut make the lane closest to Mt. Hope a drop-off lane. Other cars that are going straight through to Five Corners will learn to stay over to the left. As for dropping off if you are going south on Farragut, we have to have a different drop-off place. But as far as the northbound traffic on Farragut is concerned, and the Mt. Hope traffic is concerned, before you divert onto Rosedale you can drop your kid off at the other side of this space I am talking about; you can drop your kid off at Farragut, and there will be no cars for the children to worry about as they walk to the building.

Mayor Kinnally: The problem with that is that the buses drop off on School Street, and you cannot put that volume of traffic through that narrow street and then out onto Hillside. Mt. Hope is designed for high volume. These other streets are not.

Trustee Jennings: If we did this, maybe people who did not have to be going that way for that half-hour would not.

Trustee Swiderski: It is the only way to go.

Trustee Holdstein: I like the idea of having a closed-off pedestrian area.

Trustee Jennings: Short of something like that, we have to put a light up at the corner of Mt. Hope and Farragut. It is a crazy intersection, and something will happen there eventually. We have a policeman a half a block away, but we do not have anybody there, and it is crazy.

Mayor Kinnally: When we talked about a traffic light, the ridiculous situation is that we could not have a traffic light that could be overridden by people crossing with children.

Trustee Jennings: I understand the reason not to put it at Olinda, but I never did understand why we did not move it down to Mt. Hope.

Village Manager Hess: It is related to the number of accidents, and Olinda was the only location a light could be located according to DOT regulations.

Mayor Kinnally: We will have the resolution for a public hearing at our August meeting. We will have a public hearing on something in September. And in the interim we are going to get a lot of wisdom.

Planning Board Member Speranza: Short of something very dramatic, all that is going to happen is the problem is going to be pushed around the building. It is tough times and desperate measures. Rosedale is an idea, but you cannot do that unless you do something about the little island because so many people go around the island the wrong way at Rosedale and Hillside, and you have all the kids parking there. The drop-off in front of the middle school in that strip, I would never consider going in there because I do not know when I am ever going to get out; if somebody decides that their child has to be helped out with musical instruments or projects I could be in there for five or 10 minutes. The elimination of parking would certainly help that, so someone could swing around. But I do not know how much safer you are making it for the kids because then you have kids who are crossing, and people are pulling out and around other cars. Maybe it is time to think bigger: the lights. Or operationally, organizationally what could be done.

Village Manager Hess:, Patty is director of transportation for Westchester County and is a transportation planner.

Mayor Kinnally: And does not have an answer.

Ms. Shimsky: The reason she does not have an answer is because there is no answer. This school was not built to have this volume of vehicular traffic around it, especially with some of the oversize vehicles. I think Bruce had two ideas that are really worth running with here. One is making that right lane of Farragut Avenue a drop-off-only zone in the morning.

The second thing is he is the most eloquent person describing how terrifying that intersection of Mt. Hope and Farragut is. I have to have my 9-year-old walk to school in September for health reasons, crossing that intersection. I am terrified for him, and I hope he is not part of the statistic that ultimately result in the creation of the traffic light.

5. Other

Ms. Shimsky: There is one more public hearing on Ridge Hill in front of the Yonkers city council on July 19 at Saunders High School. If you want to weigh in and have not had a chance yet, come on out. We will all be there.

Mayor Kinnally: In that regard, I spoke before the city council, and I also am trying to set up a meeting with Mayor Amicone either individually or with some of the other mayors from the village towns.

Trustee Apel: Since Patty is here, in terms of the large tracts, next to the LI zone is an R-20 zone with property owned by the state. My concern is that if sometime down the road somebody decides the state is going to sell it, it is zoned for R-20. The Planning Board might consider making it park land with the caveat that that one house can stay. I thought we should look into before it becomes a problem in the future.

Planning Board member Speranza: A brief update on the large tracts report: it went to the members, we had two meetings on it so we could get peoples' input, and it is now back in my court. With the assistance of our new full-time planner we will respond to the comments that and go through it. One of the recommendations for that property is rezoning it to park land.

Trustee Holdstein: I was stopped by one of the members of the Department of Public Works who earnestly was trying to do his job picking up garbage in the downtown. He was frustrated, as we looked at stuff in the tree pits and everything else. He said he would like to be able to do more cleanup, but cannot because of the volume of garbage put out on Warburton by residents into our Village trash cans. I would like you to look into what we can do to better enforce what the downtown residents are doing with regard to garbage.

Village Manager Hess: The young man has approached several members of the Board and me. They are required to do the cleanup in the downtown in addition to the garbage pickup, and they cannot leave until they get it done. That is not an excuse. They are supposed to clean up all the baskets, sweep up the parking lots, pick up around the tree pits, if necessary, and clean up the alleyways. They have a complete list of what they are supposed to do.

Trustee Holdstein: Let me clarify. He showed me his truck filled with people's stuff. I sensed that he wanted to do his job of cleaning, and was being hampered by the amount of garbage. People are using those trash cans on the street when they are supposed to use their own trash cans. I would just like to explore what we can do to improve our services and clean the downtown, and enforce where there are violations.

Village Manager Hess: The only way we can enforce it is if he starts ripping open the bags and finding out who is putting their garbage out there.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Apel with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board scheduled an Executive Session immediately following the Regular Meeting to discuss personnel and litigation issues.

Mayor Kinnally: Neil is in receipt of a note from the MTA dealing with their need to have additional parking spaces during the overpass construction project. But more importantly, that MTA expects to commence the overpass project this fall, and will give the Village two weeks' notice.

Village Manager Hess: They are giving us five spaces on the other side of the hydrant.

ADJOURNMENT

On MOTION of Trustee Apel, SECONDED by Trustee Swiderski with a voice vote of all in favor, Mayor Kinnally adjourned the Regular Meeting at 10:50 p.m.