

Planning Board
Village of Tarrytown
Special Meeting
January 5, 2005 6 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Friedlander; Members Shroff, Tedesco; Counsel Shumejda;
Planner Geneslaw; Building Inspector/Engineer McGarvey; Secretary
D'Eufemia

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING – FERRY LANDINGS LLC AND FERRY
INVESTMENTS – WATERFRONT PROPERTY (LOWER MAIN STREET) – SITE
PLAN – MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT – FEIS REVIEW – TO CONSIDER
ACCEPTANCE

Chairman Friedlander stated if the Board accepts the Final Environmental Impact Statement this evening, and the Board of Trustees does likewise on January 10th, the document can then be made available for review by the public, and involved and interested agencies. The Planning Board could hopefully have Findings prepared for their meeting on January 31st. After that, the Board can focus on the site plan and the different alternatives and concepts until the best possible plan is found.

Mr. Geneslaw stated he has reviewed the FEIS and will be providing the Board with written comments. He stated he felt the document was ready for distribution and review.

Mr. Tedesco stated he has reviewed the document thoroughly and feels it meets the criteria for acceptance.

Mr. Mark Fry, 16 Independence Street, stated that based on comments tendered at the September 27th meeting by Scenic Hudson and Riverkeeper and the October 13th comments from Ed Buroughs from the County Planning Board, the sum of which was that the DEIS was not complete, he felt those issues still remain and he urged the Board not to accept the FEIS as complete until those three agencies have had a chance to review the document.

Chairman Friedlander stated all those parties, as well as the public, will be able to review the document and make any comments they wish to make. The Board will address the issues in their Findings Statement.

Mr. Bob Stone, Rivercliffe, questioned what acceptance of the FEIS signifies. Chairman Friedlander replied that the document can go out to the public for review and study. The completeness deals with the issues raised in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Chairman Friedlander stated when the County made comments on the DEIS, almost 95% of them had to do with the site plan process and approval. There are two parallel processes going on. One is whether SEQRA is complied with. Many of the issues raised by the County, and other people, are better addressed by looking at the actual site plan

and that is why the Board is reviewing the site plan as well tonight. “When I discussed it with the County, they said fine as long as we can address the issues.”

Mr. Stew Schectman, Rivercliffe, stated, “The DEIS was available in July and the public did see it. Then in October and November there were radical alternatives, which were only presented as displays in this room. I don’t understand the public involvement in moving so quickly from the DEIS to the FEIS. I don’t think there has been a lot of public digestion. Very few people have seen these major alternatives. Ron Tedesco has asked for height in feet and that has never been given to the public.” Chairman Friedlander replied that the acceptance of the FEIS is only dealing with the completeness of the document. The alternatives have come out of discussions. The site plan is the major way a Planning Board operates to control the process so it is beneficial to the community. That is what will be built. Mr. Tedesco stated the heights have been addressed in the FEIS. (3 stories is 37 ft. and 4 stories is 45 ft.) In site plan review, the Board will see the details and adjust and modify them. “All we are agreeing tonight is the applicant addressed the issues addressed in the DEIS. When we make our Findings Statement, we may say it is acceptable only with certain items.”

Mr. Sherwood Chorost, a Tarrytown Trustee and resident of The Quay, stated when he read the FEIS, he saw the number of residential units going from 128 to 224 to 287 and then 298. “Are we determining that commercial space will be changed to more residential use and do we have a number of residential units?” Chairman Friedlander stated that conversion came about by suggestions to mitigate traffic, etc. There were suggestions from Village retailers that there should not be a lot of retail at this location. There were suggestions for a jitney and pedestrian bridge to Main Street. All that is being reviewed. That is where the change came from – it did not come from the developer. It came from the Village. “We have also talked about removing the asphalt plant completely and we will have to address what will happen if that occurs.”

Mr. Chorost stated the Village has two buses and as soon as they get drivers those will provide a low cost service where people can park in the Village and then go anywhere they want. If there are 675 people – or even 500 people – here, it seems you need a convenience store. “I think the retail association should work with you on that.”

Mr. Joseph Cotter, Ferry Landings, stated they had originally proposed 40,000 sq. ft. of retail and they have now reduced that to about 7,000 sq. ft. “We are open for discussion. We feel it should probably be more like 20,000 sq. ft. We will look for your recommendations in the Findings Statement.”

Mr. Chorost stated, “The central theme of the waterfront will be where people congregate. The Village green, which has grown, is a beautiful idea and I hope it doesn’t get lost.”

Ms. Irene Kleinsinger, Martling Avenue, questioned whether the Board could put off accepting the FEIS until next month. Chairman Friedlander stated the original plan has been out for over a year. “The only thing we have done differently was to examine a number of alternatives based on the community’s interest. Only three or four people from the merchants association ever addressed this issue. I don’t have to wait for everyone in Tarrytown to learn about this. It has been around. I welcome the participation, but only a handful of people come to the meetings.”

Ms. Kleinsinger questioned whether parking on the west side of the railroad tracks will be moved to the east side in a parking garage. Chairman Friedlander stated it is a plan but it is not definitive. Funding is being explored.

Ms. Kleinsinger stated in July there was mention that the recreation/aquatics center would be maintained through fees. “If there are membership fees, a large portion of the Tarrytown citizens would not benefit from that.” Chairman Friedlander stated there are a number of ways of addressing that issue – e.g. scholarships, fees based on income, etc.

Ms. Kleinsinger questioned, in regard to open space, what views of the river will exist. Chairman Friedlander stated there is a view corridor on West Main Street. The esplanade consists of over 1,500 ft. of riverfront. There will be a park in the middle with a lot of open space, which also has a river view. Ms. Kleinsinger stated it looks like the buildings will block a lot of the views.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Shroff, and unanimously carried, that the Planning Board of the Village of Tarrytown hereby determines that, pursuant, to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Ferry Landings is accepted for review by the public, involved, and interested agencies.

Chairman Friedlander requested Mr. Cotter review the site plan with the Board.

Mr. Cotter submitted a chart, which goes through the variations of the site plans. (This chart is attached to these minutes.)

Mr. Cotter stated the other plans that resulted were due to comments from the DEIS process. All are contained in the FEIS, which includes all the data – height, traffic, etc.

The base plan included 320,000 sq. ft. of residential (88 townhouses, 40 loft apartments), 330,000 sq. ft. of office space, 10,000 sq. ft. of commercial, and a 4-story parking garage.

They were then asked to focus on a plan that had much less impact on traffic. The plan which was presented in November came as a result of the DEIS. This plan had 228 residential units (157 townhouses and 71 loft apartments), and 100,000 sq. ft. of office and commercial space.

The third scenario has come up very recently and is a product of the Mayor and Board of Trustees' direction to look at a scenario with no asphalt plant. This plan calls for 70 additional residential units for a total of 298 units (157 townhouses, 24 cottages, 71 loft apartments, 46 apartments), and 100,000 sq. ft. of office and commercial space.

Mr. Cotter noted the 24 cottages in this alternative would each be about 1,800 sq. ft with zero lot lines. They would be located in the area where the asphalt plant would have been relocated. It is a different type unit so as to not overburden the site with too many of the same type of units. Mr. Cotter stated the additional units in this alternative are the result of the \$3,000,000 expense he will incur as a result of relocation or condemnation of the plant.

Chairman Friedlander stated Scenic Hudson wants a park for Scenic Hudson in the northwest corner. When he and members of the County Planning Board walked the site recently, it turns out the property Scenic Hudson wants will look out onto Ichabod's Landing in Sleepy Hollow. He has therefore suggested that Ferry Landings stake the area so representatives from Scenic Hudson can revisit to determine if this is the best location for that park.

Mr. Fry stated the concept of a Village Green is wonderful but it may be seen as entering a private development. There should be open space in an area that can be perceived as public.

Mr. Drew Fixell, a Tarrytown Trustee and resident of Washington Street, stated he was not sure whether this Village Green works since there is a sense of it being privatized. He stated it will be necessary to study how other areas have dealt with making this type of Village Green inviting to the public.

Ms. Susan Sincero, a Tarrytown Trustee and resident of Neperan Road, questioned whether density of this project could be decreased if the recreation/aquatics center were not built. Mr. Cotter stated, "The Village is telling us what they want. The public part is what was requested of us."

Chairman Friedlander stated, "There will be units of housing built whether there is a recreation/aquatics center or not. If you were giving up density, it would be given up in the back. No one even sees or notices that. The riverfront is going to be developed. Whether it is 210, 220, or 230 units, you won't notice the difference. I go to those (existing) parks every single day. They are not used. You have a gazebo and roller rink that are never used. This community would benefit from a super recreation center." He noted this facility will also bring people to the area.

Mr. Schectman stated the Village Green needs to be an area where people will gather. There needs to be benches and walkways.

Chairman Friedlander stated, "Everyone should put together a list of things that should be there. I felt there should be more retail but we were told there should be no retail. We knew there had to be some so the developer put in about 7,000 sq. ft. I think there should be more and that would bring people into the park."

Chairman Friedlander stated the riverwalk will allow people to walk all along the river. That will naturally bring people to this area but the concern is how to get people to use the Village Green area.

Mr. Chorost suggested moving one of the buildings to the area proposed for the recreation/aquatics center and moving the recreation/aquatics center to where the band shell is located. That would open the area up.

Mr. Fry stated the County also expressed this concern. As now configured with the corridor down the center, there is concern it may not meet the Village's objectives. Chairman Friedlander stated the County said the Village should find ways of making it more accessible.

Ms. Kleinsinger stated she felt the retail should be cut down. "I would like to see more park areas than stores." Chairman Friedlander stated there was a concern about the retail space and that is why it was cut down. The parkland has been increased and everyone must determine ways to get people to use that area – e.g., sculpture gardens, fountains.

Mr. Cotter stated, "We can come up with better ways to activate the green. We just need some direction as to what you want."

Ms. Carole Griffiths, Martling Avenue, stated, "I think the Village parks are used but one of the problems is parking. There are also a lot of Canada Geese because of the plantings that are there. I think if the buildings are reconfigured, the Village Green can be reconfigured."

Ms. Griffiths questioned whether the FEIS addresses the economics – e.g., cost of removing the asphalt plant vs. number of additional units. Mr. Cotter stated the specifics of the asphalt plant will be done at the Board of Trustees level and they will determine what economics will be given in terms of incentives.

Mr. Stone stated he thought removing the asphalt plant would have lowered the overall density and height. Mr. Cotter stated the value of the land where the asphalt plant is, is probably \$1,000,000 but the cost of the asphalt plant is about \$6,000,000. There is a penalty cost of moving this business. If the County and Scenic Hudson come up with the full amount, they would not seek additional units.

Mr. Shroff stated if the asphalt plant is removed, the entire project becomes more valuable and he did not understand why any more units have to be added. Mr. Cotter stated they did not feel the asphalt plant is a major deterrent to values.

Mr. Fry stated if the asphalt plant were removed at no cost to Ferry Landings, one option would be to spread the 228 units into that space and reduce the heights. Mr. Cotter stated if someone else paid to take the asphalt plant out, they would be willing to reduce it below the 228 units.

Mr. Shroff stated, "If you just get \$15,000 more per unit without the asphalt plant, that covers the \$3,000,000." Mr. Cotter stated, "We will review that."

Mr. Tedesco stated the following needs to be accomplished:

- View corridors must be maintained
- Buildings in the center must not be more than three stories
- Parkland should not be increased if bulk is also increased
- There should be creative ways of putting in some retail and public amenities to make the Village Green inviting to the public.

Mr. Cotter stated the Board should address the retail issue in their Findings Statement.

Chairman Friedlander stated after people review the FEIS, they should submit written comments to the Board.

This matter will be continued at the Board's January 31st meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED 8:30 p.m.

Kathleen D'Eufemia
Secretary