

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK  
PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, October 20, 2016 at 8:15 p.m. in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Kathleen Sullivan, Boardmember James Cameron, Boardmember Michael Ambrozek, Boardmember Kerry Gould-Schmit, Boardmember William O'Reilly, Boardmember Richard Bass, Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., and Planning Board Secretary Mary Ellen Ballantine

**I. ROLL CALL**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Meeting of August 18, 2016**

**Meeting of September 15, 2016**

**Chairperson Sullivan:** The first item after roll call is approval of the minutes. The notice went out just saying August 18, and we also have the September 15th meeting. Correct?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** August and September minutes, yes.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Any comments on either set of meeting minutes? I'd say take the August first. May I have a motion to approve those minutes?

On MOTION of Boardmember O'Reilly, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of August 18, 2016 were approved as amended.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Any comments on the meeting minutes of September 15, 2016?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Oh, I have to abstain, as I was absent.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** No comments.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** I'm abstaining.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** So we have to carry over.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** We have to carry over till our next meeting. I have some comments, but I'm going to turn them in on a piece of paper. Hold those off again till our next meeting.

### III. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Chairperson Sullivan:** We have ahead of us tonight a few new public hearings. I'm going to use my prerogative as the chair to reshuffle the agenda slightly. The first item up will be the View Preservation Advisory for the Smalls. The second item will be the site plan approval discussion for the Julia Dyckman Andrus Memorial. Then the last one would be the site plan approval and view preservation for 425 Warburton.

1. **View Preservation Advisory – Application of Edward & Margo Small, as per Section 295-82 of the Village Code, for the construction of a rear wood deck on their single-family dwelling at 87 Pinecrest Parkway. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.100-95-35 on the Village Tax Maps.**

**Christina Griffin, project architect:** I'm the architect for a new deck at the Small residence. We're here for view preservation review. What we're planning to do is add a deck off the first floor in the back of the house. Because this property is west of Broadway we're in a view preservation zone.

This is the first floor plan, and this is the new deck.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** I don't think that's on, Christina.

**Ms. Griffin:** This is our first-floor plan. There is currently no deck here so you have to go downstairs through the basement to get into the yard in the back, and there is actually a garage below. (I don't know why I can't seem to get the next page up here). This is our site plan. We've done (let's try that ) ... this is our site plan, just to show that there is actually a driveway and a garage that's never really used in the back here, it's so far down. We're planning to put the deck here.

These are our elevations showing the south elevation side of the house with the deck off the

back, then the north elevation showing the deck from the other view. This is our west elevation that has the deck above the garage doors. These are view studies. This is the view from Pinecrest Parkway; this is before, and this is after. You can see my cursor, you can see how we superimposed the deck onto the photograph. This is the view also from Pinecrest Parkway from a distance. There is a tiny piece of the deck you can see from the road. But you see, you really can't see the view of the river because of all the trees.

This is the view from the property at 67 Pinecrest. This is before above, and after below. This is the deck that's been added on there. This is the view from 91 Pinecrest Parkway, which is to the north looking from their deck onto the house, before and after. I also want to say that the properties on each side also have decks.

Do you have any questions?

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Any questions from the Board?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, I would have thought this could have been a situation, actually, where you, Madam Chair, and the chair of the ZBA and the Building Inspector could have possibly done the view preservation approval because there's really very, very minor impact on any views.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Well, that's just the fact that there's a minor impact on the view. Our code says, for the waiver process, that there has to be no impact whatsoever.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Clearly no impact.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** So even though I would have loved to have sent this for a waiver because it's so minor, we couldn't because of the way the code's written.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** The chair of the Zoning Board and Buddy and myself felt that ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** In the fullness of applying the code, you would bring in the Board.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** ... in applying the code that it would make ... we felt more comfortable having a public discussion.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I understand.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** It's something we tried very hard to do but, as Buddy said, this

particular time we felt we'd err on the side of caution.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I was going to say, knowing that house, the only people who are going to find an impact on the view are the people in the house, looking out on the deck. Previously, they didn't have a deck.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Jamie, anything?

**Boardmember Cameron:** No comments.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Kerry?

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** No comments.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Any comments from the public? OK. In that case, may I have a motion to approve this application for view preservation and refer it to the ZBA?

On MOTION of Boardmember Ambrozek, SECONDED by Boardmember O'Reilly with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the permit application of Florin Mihai Cuibus for the accessory apartment located at 237 Farragut Avenue, including a waiver for square footage.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Thank you very much ...

**Ms. Griffin:** Thank you very much.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** ... for letting us do our job.

As I mentioned, we will now move to the site plan approval, the application, for the Julia Dyckman Andrus Memorial.

2. **Site Plan Approval** – Application of Julia Dyckman Andrus Memorial for the demolition and subsequent construction of a new classroom building located on their complex at 1156 North Broadway. Subject property is in the R-20 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.140-150-2 on the Village Assessment Roll.

**Gary Spilatro, Spilatro Architect:** Good evening. I'm the architect for Andrus. What we're proposing is to remove an existing building on-site which is used for a classroom, one classroom, and storage. To construct a new classroom building, with an office, a sensory room and storage, and two handicap bathrooms. It's a modular construction. What they will be doing is centralizing their classrooms. There's one classroom in Griffin Hall, which is at the southeast corner of the campus – it's about a quarter-mile away – for the children to walk to that classroom. They're bringing that classroom group into this building, too, so it'll be centralized near the classroom. We're using the same concrete pad that's existing there now, increasing is slightly by – let's see, increasing it by 750 square feet, roughly.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Could you give us the square footage of the building?

**Mr. Spilatro:** OK, yes. The existing building is 2,144 square feet, the pad. The new building, with the stairs and sidewalks, total coverage is 2,917 square feet. So an increase of 773 square feet.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** But that's coverage, as we've talked about.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Yeah.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's a one-story building?

**Mr. Spilatro:** It's a one-story building on top of a crawl space, a 4 foot high crawl space, to get the mechanicals in.

The classroom's are going to be 616 square feet, for eight students each. There will be no increase of the students on campus, so it's just relocation of the one undersized classroom in Griffin Hall, bringing them over, and one undersized existing classroom inside there. Both don't function correctly. They would have eight students in each classroom. Right now, they function with, I believe, six students in each, and the maximum is eight. That's where they function the best.

There'd be two handicap toilets, a foyer, storage closets, a sensory room, and one office. It'd be self-contained, have sprinkler systems, security, fire alarms, all the basics.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** It looked like you had to extend, through this site, electric and water that wasn't there.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Yes. There is no sewer connection there now. There is electrical, but it will not be enough to handle the air conditioning units. There's just one room in there which has got a window unit, that's all.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** But all the trenching and whatnot for those utilities is happening in already disturbed areas.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Yes, it's a playground area. There is a water line that comes through it, and we have two catchbasins that we can connect the roof leaders into. The building just drains right in there right now anyhow, so it just drains into the grass which then drains directly into the catchbasin, which will just connect directly into the catchbasins down.

We're removing one tree – scrubby tree – in the back, one dead tree which I didn't even note on the drawings. No shrubberies planned around it because the children can hide behind it. They don't need to lose somebody, OK? And that's about as simple as it is.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** It is. Any questions from the Board? Kerry, I'll start on your side. Any questions?

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** No. I understand the need for modular. It's maybe not the most attractive, but ...

**Mr. Spilatro:** Functional.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** ... it's cost-effective.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Yes.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Jamie?

**Boardmember Cameron:** I have no questions now.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Bill?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** You're out there, and you're only going to disturb 0.8 acres?

**Mr. Spilatro:** The campus is a little under 100 acres.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** No despoiling of anything else.

**Mr. Spilatro:** No.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Michael, any questions?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes. They're increasing the impervious coverage by 770 square feet, so where does the catchbasin you're going to attach to drain to?

**Mr. Spilatro:** On the site plan, you'll see two of them located.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Right, but do they drain into the Yonkers sewer system?

**Mr. Spilatro:** Oh, no. I believe the catchbasin is just a drywell right now. It drains that whole playfield, the main one that's right next to it. Then the one across the road, I'm not sure where that comes. It's just there.

Sorry about that, but the campus is old and there is no location of the storm drains. The sanitary lines, we know where they are but we don't know where the storm drains go. But there's a pond in the back. We just redid the stone bar, and that feeds directly into the pond. That just stays there, and it's an old pond that was made.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** OK. So you actually have a drywell right now. One of the catchbasins definitely goes into the drywell.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Yes, the catchbasin is a drywell.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** All right.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Which drains the whole play area, which was the drain there.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** No, which is the predominant drain right now for the building.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Yes.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I think that addresses my concern.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** It seems like a small coverage.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** A small increase, yes. And a lot of it, there's already a lot of natural drainage around it.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** It was nice for you to provide the plan that showed where the wetlands were because that's very unusual that you actually have federal or state (cross-talk) ...

**Mr. Spilatro:** Well, they had a study done on the campus and they know what their property was.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Because they have a base map.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** It's good to be able to understand that this is all happening without any sense of (unintelligible).

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, I was also impressed by your topographic map that showed all your steep slopes by categories. That was very useful, too.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Thank you.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Any comment from the public on this application? All right, if there are no questions may I have a motion to approve this application for site plan approval?

On MOTION of Boardmember Gould-Schmit, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application of Julia Dyckman Andrus Memorial for the demolition and subsequent construction of a new classroom building located on their complex at 1156 North Broadway.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Just to note for the record, this is a type two action under SEQRA's nonresidential building under 4,000 square feet so nothing further is required under SEQRA.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Thank you. I brought my part two in case we had to do something.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** But we don't.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** That's the size question, so thank you very much.

**Mr. Spilatro:** Thank you.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Good luck.



**Village Attorney Whitehead:** So we got through those two really quick.

3. **View Preservation Advisory & Site Plan Approval – Application of Tabi Realty, LLC, as per Sections 295-82 and 295-104, for the demolition of an existing three family & construction of a new building containing three townhouse units on its property at 425 Warburton Avenue. Said property is located in the MR-O Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.70-52-10&11 on the Village Tax Maps.**

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Before we get going on this one, we are kind of caught in an unusual situation because we have an application in front of us that is missing a fair amount of information. When we had last seen this application we offered to have another discussion. I think we're at a point where (unintelligible) pertinent for a discussion than for a full application for site plan approval.

But that being said, what I hope we can accomplish today with these things is getting the applicant directions from the Board of what information we need ... what we want to see pursued, revised, whatever. I also would like to identify the information we need for further discussion. I'm going to go out there and (off-mic) information, and also would like to hear from the public who have come to talk about this application.

All that said and done, we're ready to try to work, I think, to make this project work well within the community and work with the owner. Love to hear more about what you prepared for us today, and explain to the public what you have.

**Christina Griffin, project architect:** I'm the architect for a new multi-family building at 425 Warburton Avenue. I agree with everything you just said, and would like to continue the discussion. Especially since the last meeting we had, we were throwing around a lot of ideas. One was to look at just three units, which is what we submitted, and another to actually look at more than three perhaps.

Actually I brought with me tonight the other schemes we didn't submit, and maybe you would like to see those.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Say that again?

**Ms. Griffin:** We brought the other schemes to let you know that we did look at having more than three units. I just thought, just for discussion, you might like to see it. I'm going to start

with the scheme we submitted that you've already reviewed, though. Again, I would like us to work together. When we have a project that needs variances, I'd like to see if we can try to get it in shape so when do go to the Zoning Board we are confident that this is something that works well.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I think that's the plan for the Board is, what we want to do is to work and get the site plan to a point where if there are variances needed we could potentially have a joint meeting, like we discussed, to make sure those variances have our explanation of why we think they're appropriate. But the goal is to get the site plan in good shape.

**Ms. Griffin:** Exactly. I appreciate that. I'm sorry, I'm just having some trouble getting this up.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Check the connection again?

**Jim Metzger, 427 Warburton Avenue:** Excuse me. It's a little hard to hear. If people could speak into the microphone a little bit more it'd be easier. It's just difficult to hear in the audience. Thank you.

**Ms. Griffin:** (Ay yi yi).

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Is it the mouse or is it the connection?

**Ms. Griffin:** It's the mouse, you think?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Sorry, technical difficulties. It's the mouse.

**Ms. Griffin:** OK, I'll try to work without it even though I like having it.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Now it's working.

**Ms. Griffin:** OK. This is actually just a quick sketch. Eventually we're going to do a nice rendering. Just to give you some idea of what the elevations that were submitted, what it might look like, we really want to have something that really ties in very nicely with this neighborhood. Right now, there's an existing building that is at the corner on the northern end. We're planning to make it a larger building and have at least three units.

This scheme is showing that the existing building is right here. This is a three-story, three-unit building. We have a lot that is ... I have to enlarge this. I think it's 7,150 square feet. We are only allowed a certain amount of lot area per unit. For the MR-O zone, for this lot,

we can only do three units unless we get a variance. We looked at seeing if we can provide parking, since we want to upgrade the building. Everything needs to be upgraded, updated, and we want to put the three units back. But we really would like to add the parking that's required by code, which is six parking spaces. We did look very carefully to see if we could somehow use the building. The problem with that is that we have to raise it up 2 feet to get enough height for parking underneath without a driveway that is unreasonably sloped, or steep. We decided you would have to lift the whole building up and have steel supports in order to make sure of it, so it's not economically feasible to keep the building.

We're proposing a new building. This is showing three townhouses, and this footprint is actually entirely based on the shape we need for the garage underneath so we can get six parking spaces. On our site plan, the building is to the right. That's because we would like to put the curbcut to the left for a variety of reasons. One is, it seems to make sense to have the ramp on the left. There's already a curbcut right near here. There's kind of probably a parking area that is not really a legal parking space but is used for parking there. We want to keep that area for the driveway, going down into the garage underneath.

Also, because of the shape of the lot it doesn't make sense to put the driveway here because we would have a very awkward shape for the building. Also, on this side we have the property to the north practically touching the property line. We would like to keep the driveway on the south side.

This scheme shows this is a ramp that goes down to a turnaround. It has one space outside and five inside, and I will show you the garage layout. Also, we designed it so the back wall of this building is in line with the original back wall because of view preservation. People have views looking down towards GW Bridge and we wanted to make sure we didn't make that any worse. This building actually is stepped because the units above align with the old building, where the old wall of the building was. But the garage comes out about another 4 feet, only because we couldn't quite get the garage. The one story up the building does come out a few feet past the old building.

These are our sections through the site. Let's see if I can blow this up a bit. I wonder if I can make it even bigger. Yeah, that would be nice, OK? This is the existing building. We measured to the top of the building, with a laser device, at 32 feet 6. This is the 40-foot maximum height. And this shaded area is the building just to the north, which is 427. This is the proposed new building. This is our maximum height, and we're trying to keep within that so we staggered the shape of the building. We have lifted the first floor up 2 feet from where it is now so we can have an 8-foot ceiling in the basement and a 15 percent slope.

The back of the building, right here, is aligned with the original building. If you see this dashed line, this is the existing building. We've lifted it up from 32, 6 to 34 feet 6. It still keeps within the maximum height because of the way it's been stepped.

There's a small piece, about 4 feet of the garage, that goes past the old wall of the old building that we're taking down. Over here, you're seeing a raised area with a retaining wall because we could not fit all the parking spaces within this footprint. The reason we were trying to work with getting the building from this wall towards the east is to avoid impact on views of the neighboring properties. We visited 427, the small house next door, and went into their first floor, went into the second floor. We know they are going to be looking towards ... well, right now there's a lot of greenery in place. But probably, more in the wintertime, they may have river views. So we're trying to respect that and make sure the building doesn't impinge upon those views.

This is a garage plan that is very important to look at carefully. So much of the bulk and the shape of the building really has to do with meeting the parking requirements for the three units. We have a driveway slope. I work in a lot of sloped, steep properties and I know the maximum is 8, and then possibly 12. But I have worked on properties, and I've seen even 20. I feel this could work at 15, but we need a variance for that. The reason we are trying to get the driveway steeper than the maximum code is because we're trying to keep the building as low as possible. We don't want to lift it up too high because it's going to impact views that are uphill.

By going at a 15 percent slope, we have to raise the building 2 feet. Down this ramp we have our 25-foot turnaround, which is the code minimum. So you can turn around into the garage, then we have five spaces here – handicapped parking, with a handicapped aisle – and an elevator. One of the three townhouses has to be fully handicapped-accessible by code. Because of the access we sited would be on this side – and it has a lot to do with the shape of the lot and the proximity of this building – we have a turnaround space here. We end up bringing our parking around the perimeter of the building and have like a corner, a dead corner. This is a perfect location for like the elevator and possibly a staircase.

We could not fit any more than five spaces inside this shape so we have an outdoor space and retaining wall here. That's simply because we don't want our building to go too far past the existing wall of the old building. If you see this dashed line here, even though the building comes close to this property line it's still a few feet in. We have one point where it is very tight and we're going to, of course, need a variance for that.

This is our first-floor plan. When we lift the garage up so we can get an 8-foot minimum ceiling height in the garage and a ramp coming down, we will need a few steps in front. We

actually decided we would locate our new wall in line with the old wall, and would have an approximately 40-foot by 16 foot 2 shape to work with for each townhouse. But we kept it 4 feet 6 back so we would have room for steps going out into the buildings. Our setback that's required is 10 feet, and this setback is only 4 feet 8 so we would need a variance for that. As you might know – and I'll show you some photographs of the street – many buildings are actually right on the property line.

This is our second-floor plan. We have two bedrooms on the second floor. The old building's three stories, the new building's three stories, but we have a bigger unit. The unit sizes range from 1,700 to almost 1,900. This is the largest unit because it's fully handicapped-accessible and has an elevator. These units have a bedroom-two bath from the second floor, and then on the third floor there's a third bedroom with a family room space and decks.

You know, the intention is to design these units so they are for homeowners. We wanted to have, of course, parking not to just meet code, but so each owner would have his or her own parking space; two) because we have three-bedroom units, and each person would have their own private outdoor space. In this scheme, all the decks are lined up with the old wall of the original building; they don't go beyond that wall.

These are view preservation studies, and this is our table of zoning data. I'd like to just go over the variances that would be required for this project. All right, I'm just going back to this because I would like to just go through the variances we are going to need. For the three-townhouse scheme. we need a variance because the front yard setback is not meeting the 10 foot that's required. This is our setback, so we need a variance for front yard setback. It's really because we cannot get the unit to work if it's this short; it ends up cutting off a bedroom probably. Also, we feel that a lot of the buildings on the street are either right at the property line, like the one next door and the one that used to be there.

So there's a whole variety of setbacks, but many of them close to the property line. We are going to be asking for a side yard setback right here because this is a corner. The reason why this is so close is really because of the footprint of the garage below. The footprint of the garage is determining, very much, the whole shape of the building. We are also going to be asking for a variance for the size of parking spaces. We've made them only 8 feet 6 wide instead of 9 feet wide, which is our code minimum. But there are many parking spaces throughout the Village at 8 foot 6.

Our driveway area is 1,229, so it's over the 960 square feet and we need a variance for that. We also need a variance because we're asking for a slope of 15 percent. We have about three variances just related to the driveway and the parking spaces: one for the front yard setback

and one for this side yard setback. We will be at a lot coverage of 42 percent, and the maximum is 50 percent in an MR-O zone. We're also very conscious of trying to create greenspace. The benefit of pulling the building away from where it is now, you see this hatched area existing. We're pulling the building away and we're creating some greenspace here so there's more of a separation between these two buildings. Then there could be a common greenspace on the back. What's really lovely about a lot of these buildings on Warburton Avenue – and I lived in the one at 433 for two years – they looked north and south and there's a lot of greenspace in the back of the buildings.

Now I'm going to go through the building permit studies for this submission. Well, maybe I'll just roll up our key plan first. There are several photographs taken, and some with a drone if you get up really high. This is before and after, and this is looking at the property from, I think, 20 Marble Terrace looking down. Because right now, this is 421 Warburton – I'm not sure if you can see it – and there's that white fence, and this is the new building we're proposing. This is from 15 to 25 Marble Terrace, before and after. Let's see if I can get that a little bigger. I don't know if you can see the shape. This is before and this is after. This is when you're looking down through the courtyard of the affordable housing project. This is looking from 6 Division Street, this is before and after. You see the lot's been filled in.

By the way, there was a building here a long time ago that, I think, was burned down. I'm not sure when, I just know there's some history of that. This is before and after, looking at the building from the third floor of 422 Warburton. This is looking at the before and after from the middle building at 422 Warburton. And this is looking before and after from the third floor on the north side of 422 Warburton. This is looking from 3 Hogan Place. We had a drone camera take this picture so we could see what the view would be from way up above. This is the view looking out the window of the second floor at 427 Warburton Avenue; this is before, and this is after. This is the wall of the old building, but it bumps out at the garage level. That was that 4 feet we needed to make the garage work.

This is another view of 427, the second floor. We're higher up here. This is before, and we're going to, still, the bump-out of the garage. Probably in the wintertime they can see, but looking pretty much south I'm not sure if there are river views there. This is looking from the neighbor on the south. This is before and after. You can see the side of the building and the driveway going down to the garage. This was taken from 13 Division, before and after, using a drone camera. This is taken from the second floor of 422, on the north end.

Now, I also wanted to discuss some of the other ... I thought you might like to know about the other schemes, only because we looked at other schemes to see if we can come up with a better layout that reduces impact on view. I just wanted to show you, as part of our discussion, other ideas we examined. Let's see if I can get this here. Suzanne, where is

scheme eight? There it is. OK, excellent. When we have these kinds of projects where we've got old infrastructure, we want to upgrade it and we want to provide for an amount of parking. But it's difficult to do that and meet all the zoning regulations, where you're always looking for other ideas, better ideas.

So we did look at the idea of perhaps instead of bringing the building right to the property line. This is in response to the idea of doing that. We talked about it at the last meeting, just the possibility. What we liked about it, it got rid of that bump-out of the garage. I can fit the entire garage now so this building now might ... all the garage level and all three stories can line up with the wall of the old building. When the neighbors are looking this way, they wouldn't see that garage one-story piece bumping out. This is the site sections for this scheme, where instead of bringing this back a few feet we would have the building come right to the property line. That way, we're able to line up the entire wall here and not have it bump out at the bottom.

The units, in this scheme, we are able to get an elevator and a stair to fit here. We took a look at seeing if we can get every unit handicapped-accessible. Instead of having three townhouses we have three apartments, one on top of the other. So we took a look at that. Actually, these units are pretty much the same size as the townhouses. They are three-bedroom, two-bath units. If we did this scheme – and let me get the first floor – we wouldn't have stoops because we could have one entrance and one central stair, an elevator, and one unit on each floor. Some of the benefits of this scheme is that each floor can be handicapped-accessible. Also, we wouldn't have a lot of natural light on four sides of the unit. When you have townhouses, the middle one only has light from the back. And even the ends only have windows on three sides.

This is the scheme that has the least impact on view because of the way we are able to – and I think I want to go back to that garage plan to show you ... because we pushed the building forward to the property line we are able to get to get this to line up with the old building so there wouldn't be another piece of the building projecting out from where it is now. That would give us the least impact on view. On each level, we also tucked in the decks. We tucked in decks so they wouldn't go beyond the wall and fit inside the same footprint and same limitation of the wall of the old building. Each of these units, if we put one on top of the other rather than townhouses, there would be around 1,800 square feet each; three-bedroom, two-baths very similar to the size of the townhouse units.

Now, this is a preliminary façade, east façade, and we're going to be exploring how we can come up with massing and a scale that really fits this neighborhood. There's a pattern of traditional building where façades usually aren't any wider than 20 feet or 25 feet. We are planning to break up the building, have interesting cornice lines which you see a lot in the

downtown that will break up the mass, and have elements that tie in with surrounding old buildings. Most of the buildings are probably from the early 1900s. This is a side facing north, the side facing the back, with all the decks. This is our elevated area for the outdoor parking. And this is the side facing south, showing the 15 percent driveway slope.

By the way, the slope that's there now is 16 percent. If you went to the site and walked down there, we measured it as 16. We stopped at 15 because just in my experience we've had to sometimes. for a similar problem where we don't want the building to be too high and have to have a ramp to get down to parking, we've used that slope. It doesn't seem to be too steep.

Then, I just wanted to show you – since it was brought up at the pre-submission meeting – to take a look at more units. We did, and I brought it tonight just so you could see what our thought process was. This proposal has – and I'll just take out the word "townhouse" – a multi-family building with six units. The building still lines up with this wall, but all the decks come out. The decks would have to project beyond the wall of the house and it would have an impact on the view of the neighbors, or we eliminate decks altogether. But to have six units, these six units I wanted to explain.

These are three-bedroom – like 2-1/2 bedrooms – and 3 one-bedroom. The reason is that we're still using this corner, which is a dead corner in the garage for our elevator and stair, that breaks up the building into a smaller and larger piece. So we have a one-bedroom here, and two- or three-bedrooms on this side. We have the same layout on every floor. The building would get bigger if we did six units, or the structure. Because if we wanted to have the decks – and it was our goal that each family and each unit would have their own outdoor space – it would have to go beyond this wall. It would have more impact on view.

We also would have to have, of course, more parking spaces. If you use the formula for how many spaces you need per one-bedroom and three-bedroom we come up with a number of 11. We would need 11 spaces for six. Those six spaces would actually be ... you know, we'd have to have a much larger outdoor space for parking. We would have our five in here, and another six out here. There would be much less greenspace and we would have more variances for this kind of project.

The lot coverage would be 54 percent, So it would go over the maximum of 50, and we would have more impact on view and we would have the most significant variance – which I know is very difficult to get – or density, We have six units; you're supposed to have – I think we came up with – 12,000 square feet. The lot is 7,150. I just wanted you to know that we looked at this and were very concerned this would be very difficult to achieve a variance. You know, I did a study for 32-34 Washington of 24 properties. But we went to the Zoning Board and increased it to 119 properties to show them what kind of lot area per unit existed



in the neighborhood. I think the town wants a good explanation of why it's important. Of course, this does really help our clients because it makes it more financially viable. It's a much better investment when you have six units.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I think one other option we talked about last time was keeping the existing building. Did you look at that?

**Ms. Griffin:** I did, and I discussed that in the very beginning. I don't mean to be too dismissive of it, it's just funny. These are bearing walls of the old building, and if you don't raise the structure of the first floor you won't get enough height to put the garage underneath. Plus, we have to knock out this entire wall. And I actually did this on a beautiful Victorian. We put the whole building on giant laminated beams and lifted it up. It's extremely expensive to do that. If it's a very precious building we want to restore we might want to put that kind of money into it, but this would be very difficult because structurally the bearing walls don't line up where we want them to be; we have to upgrade all the kitchens and baths; we don't have enough height and would have to pick the whole building up. And the foundation isn't deep enough under there so you have to underpin the whole thing. It's one of those cases where it would probably be more expensive to do that than to build new.

Plus, one of the drawbacks with any building that's so close to the property line is that New York State code doesn't allow windows. So you don't get the benefit of having light when the wall is so close to the property line. Zero to 3 feet you can't have any, zero to 5 feet you can have like – I don't know – 10 percent. And the further away you go, the more windows you can have.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** It has to be, I think, 25 percent. And it just keeps going up from there.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Thank you.

**Ms. Griffin:** I also wanted to mention that we're well aware that we need the civil engineering component for this submission, we need an environmental assessment statement, and want to get some guidance from you before we can say definitively that one scheme is the one we're going with. I wanted you to see this because I think you probably want to know whether we examined the ideas from the pre-submission meeting. I think we have looked at most of the ideas.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** My statement at the beginning, I totally support not going into engineering at this particular point because we have some work to do together. When I mention that the submission was lacking a lot of information is that there were no elevations,

no site sections, no site grading as part of our package. So it's my perspective that I think there are certain things we can discuss, potentially effectively, without that information. But without that, it was very difficult to understand – as I shared with the Board – the impact of this building.

I think I'd also like to – if it's OK with you – open it up for Board comment and then take public comment. My hope is that we can address some of the items we can address – height, setback, potentially the slope of the driveway, and also come to any agreement or any direction that would be helpful. But there is definitely information we'll need to see next time, when you come back.

**Ms. Griffin:** We will be doing that, but if we have a firmer direction then the next step is grading.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Again, I also want to step back a bit because I don't want to get caught up in the weeds. You've gotten very detailed about variances you want, and my reaction to that was we're a little bit ahead of the variance. I think the Board has to talk among themselves, hear with the public, and work with you before we get to whether we support this variance versus that.

Anyways, I'd love to hear from my fellow Boardmembers. Kerry, do you want to kick us off?

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Just for a little clarity, on the scheme you submitted when you're talking about the garage you said you might be able to fit a stair.

**Ms. Griffin:** Yes.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Could it possibly be that there would only be elevator access from the garage up?

**Ms. Griffin:** If you have townhouses it would be only one that would need to be handicapped-accessible. I think after we submitted it we realized we probably could fit the stair because it just made sense to have that unit still have its own staircase.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** OK, so I'm still not clear. You can fit a stair and the elevator in scheme one from the garage floor up? I guess I'm just wondering, from scheme two, let's say you mention a setback. You want a variance on the front yard setback. Are you saying that if you move to the property line and gain that 4-1/2, I'm not opposed to a straight wall and building out?

**Ms. Griffin:** Oh, yes. In fact, you're getting at exactly why we didn't show the stair. That's because with the setback there it's another kind of disadvantage of the scheme. We don't have as much space here, and we need a utility room – we've got to have one – and we need an elevator and maybe a stair. But it's very tight. I think the other scheme, because we've pulled it forward, we can fit all that in there.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** That's, I guess, what I am getting at. You're saying if you build to the property line, I'm just trying to figure out if this scheme even works if you can't get a stair in there.

**Ms. Griffin:** You know what? Actually, right now our preference is scheme B. You know, I've been to the Zoning Board so many times for many years, and I think now they're very sensitive and very concerned about meeting, strictly, the code.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Which one?

**Ms. Griffin:** We're looking very carefully and we wanted to see if there's a way to provide a setback there. Because I do think the numbers matter a lot to them. It's like you have your variances 100 percent. We wanted very much to see if we could get some space there and make it work, but really scheme B works better.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** OK, so I'm just asking about the other buildings on the block, the street wall. I mean, I've looked, but I just am wondering have you done that type of research. Are they built out to property line?

**Ms. Griffin:** The one right to the left is.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** I mean, they appear to be? I'm just wondering.

**Ms. Griffin:** I can't say how many, but I could come back with that information. There are quite a few. We have some photographs, too, and this one does, the old house building does, and there's a few going north. But I could show you a plan if you'd like to see how many are like that. You know, we're trying to push the building towards the front because of the view impact. When I worked at 433 Warburton, if you look at the building as an odd shape because the top of it lines up with neighbors' buildings, they're very sensitive about looking up and down the river.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** I'm just saying on scheme one I think it would be untenable. You can't really have a garage without a staircase in it up to the units. I'm sort of still not understanding.

**Ms. Griffin:** You can walk up the driveway.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** The driveway, the sloped driveway?

**Ms. Griffin:** No, we probably will look into putting the stair there. You know, we usually try to get utilities in each unit, and there wouldn't be a lot down there anyway. We would have to look into that to make sure that scheming works. I think we should have a stair there.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** OK. And I guess I am just worried, the side yard setback. My question was going to be windows, and I should probably know, to the southern property. What is your distance there?

**Ms. Griffin:** On the south side?

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Yeah.

**Ms. Griffin:** We have 17 feet. This south side? That's what you meant? We have a 5-foot buffer. We want to do like a hedge here to soften it.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** OK, because of the drive.

**Ms. Griffin:** And the 12-foot driveway.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** That's it for now.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Plus, the 5-foot buffer would be required by code. She's trying to avoid another variance.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Buddy, would building code require a stairway from the garage?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** From the garage? I don't believe so, but I will look into it.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** So the question about that stairway, it means you have to come out of the garage to get into your apartment? You can't do it internally?

**Ms. Griffin:** Right.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** The sloped driveway, I would really look into that.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Just from a usage point of view.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** That may be a benefit to scheme B.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Well, scheme B, yeah. Are you asking us for a preference on scheme A or scheme B?

**Ms. Griffin:** I'm very open. I really want to continue our discussion.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I think we can comment on what they proposed, and (off-mic). Jamie's pointing out plans A and B and one scheme or the other.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Well, there were three.

**Boardmember Cameron:** That's scheme B right there.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Kerry, are you done for the moment?

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** I'm good for now, yeah. Still trying to adjust.

**Boardmember Cameron:** In looking at the one you distributed to us, I kept looking at it and saying to myself, you know, we're using an incredible amount of space for staircases. As you know, I really like – to use the British term – "flats," rather than townhouses.

**Ms. Griffin:** I know you do.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Then I looked at the elevator, and I figured you'd wasted 400 or 500 square feet in there with the stairs. Then the stairs, if you could pull it out to the street you could put the stairs going into the building and only have one of them. There's a lot of space being wasted there. One of our problems – and we still haven't discussed that yet – is the proximity to your neighbor to the north and what's the best we can do on that. I think having elevator access from the basement, from your car all the way up to the front door of your apartment, would be a nice thing. Then the staircase, as well.

I think having it next to the road, not set back, we have examples of that across the street and what have you. We should keep that in mind, but I don't want to get too far ahead. I like B

better, even though I haven't got a copy of the plan yet, or I *think* I like it better. We also have a bunch of other issues we have to deal with on the south side. But I think B is just superior. We should go from there, from my perspective, and see what we can make fly.

I'll also say one more thing just to speak up for the old guys and for the young parents in that building. Carrying a baby carriage up the stairs and down again, and kids up and down, it's much nicer to have elevators. That's something to speak for anybody who's going to live in that building.

**Ms. Griffin:** No, I agree.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Jamie, would you mind saying what you thought was superior about the other scheme?

**Boardmember Cameron:** B?

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Yeah.

**Boardmember Cameron:** B, I'm not against coming right up to the street line. I think we have a nice road going there, and I don't think that's a problem. It's an issue, but not a big problem. Secondly, it gets rid of internal staircases. You know, we go from three sets of staircases down to one. Third, we get to absorb a single stoop inside the building and not three stoops outside the building. Fourth, it's accessible for a wider range of people in the town to live in. So for all those reasons I thought it was better.

Also, it appears that you're interested in breaking it visually into three buildings. Of course, they could do that with A, as well. But those were the things that occurred to me. I think even though it's not the official scheme, it would be nice if you could leave Buddy with A, B and C.

**Ms. Griffin:** We have copies here. We can distribute them.

**Boardmember Cameron:** That would be wonderful. Let me see if I had anything more. No, those were the things.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Well, thank you. Bill?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I know we're not voting on schemes, but I think I'll go with Jamie on this one. I think the internal use of space in scheme B is probably much more economical and a better use of space. The obvious question, though, is that you have obvious entrances

and exits that are different arrangements than having your own separate entrance. It depends what people prefer in terms of appearance and use of the space. I think you've presented two, from my perspective, viable options. But we're talking about that as a concept, and if we're at the concept level we're not worrying about view preservation at this point, are we?

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Well, it's not so much worrying about it as I don't know how much of the information we have. I mean, I can speak for just a second. The scheme (inaudible) from the perspective, we're assuming there are going to be three units; we're assuming there's parking that has to be accommodated, and that parking size is now dictating the structure above. That's kind of like the cart before the carriage, or whatever the expression is.

The other issue, I think, with view preservation is that the perspective is from the neighbors adjacent, and what that view is. There have been some indications in these photographs showing view preservation from other areas. There may be other views that are up the river, up the road, up towards the Aqueduct. I don't want to, I said before, get into the weeds in a sense. I think we have some bigger issues to talk about, about how this building fits into the community. Jamie's supporting and Kerry's supporting coming up to the lot line, that kind of thing. If there's a variance like that we think we can support, we can share that, with the Zoning Board and give our reasons for it.

I think we should talk about the setbacks on the side yard, as well. Talk about view preservation from any perspective you wish. But again, I'd love us to talk about this in a bigger context at this point. I think the community deserves that, frankly. There's been some assumptions that have presented, and they are all, in my book, to be questioned.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I just had one other question. Does scheme B have the same number of variances required as the one you presented in scheme A?

**Ms. Griffin:** I can tell you what they are, I have a list. The lot coverage is a little less. Actually, it's 40 percent so we don't need a variance for that. For scheme B we need the same variances for parking. We have 8 foot 6 spaces, and the slope of the driveway, and the driveway area. Those three relate to the driveway for both schemes. We need those three variances.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You need a bigger setback.

**Ms. Griffin:** We need a bigger variance. You know, we were reluctant to come exactly to the street for the first scheme. But I think this exercise is going to be presented again to the Zoning Board so they can see the advantages of coming to the street. Hopefully, they'll

appreciate that. So we need the front yard. They are actually the same variances. We also need the same side yard.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** When will they go to Zoning?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** When you're ready to send them.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** OK.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** When you're comfortable with the plan and ready to make a recommendation.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I know they're on the agenda for the next meeting.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** We deferred that on the agenda.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Just from my perspective, I think that side yard setback that Jamie had mentioned, I suppose when we hear from the public we'll be informed about that. But in my opinion, that's a tough one to figure out.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Kathleen, I'd like to say I like the concept of the apartments. My reason is, it certainly allows more light overall, especially where there would have been a townhouse in the middle. Warburton already has lots of buildings up to the property line on the street, and actually this would be consistent. I like the idea of how you set the décor on the exterior of the building to fit with the dimensions of other buildings along the road.

I have a thought. You didn't want to put the driveway on the north side, but I think if you try shifting the building south along the street that you could put the driveway in. It'd have to go underneath the building itself, not outside the building. Firstly, Warburton naturally slopes from south to north there, or at least that's what your diagram showed, your illustration showed. So you might be able to reduce the gradient of the driveway. If you do it underneath the building you might be able to angle it a little along the side of the building. I just think there's a possibility that you could get a better garage space internally.

**Ms. Griffin:** I'd like to respond to that. Once you have a driveway in the middle, by coming down the middle of the driveway then you'll have turnaround space. We can't have it come through the middle.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** No, no. I didn't say the middle. Put the driveway on the north side of the building.



**Ms. Griffin:** The setback is half the height of the nearest wall. I have to look it up, but 17.7. So we were only going to get a variance from the side yard, and we want it to meet the setback here. There's a couple of reasons. I think it's also the shape. It's very hard to put the driveway here. But we didn't put the driveway under the building only because you would lose a huge chunk of the first floor if you did that. We can't pull the building over here. Well, I guess we could get a variance for a very narrow side yard here, and then have a larger side yard on this side. But just keep in mind, the building right now goes right up to the edge. A lot of that old building isn't shown on this plan, but I'll move it. We have pulled it back from where it is.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yeah, the fact that you pulled it back is good. I mean, I think a lot of the things you're doing to accommodate sight lines is good. I'm just trying to suggest an alternative approach for the driveway. Other buildings do have driveways going in underneath the building, or maybe you could adjust it, taking advantage by shifting the building, even putting the driveway outside on the north side. I know you say it's an odd angle.

**Ms. Griffin:** I think you can flip the whole scheme, if you can imagine that.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yeah.

**Ms. Griffin:** Flip it, but I don't think you can put the driveway under the building. We could consider doing that, even though I just think this is a really nice yard. It would be a driveway right now against that yard, or that property, whereas this building comes right to the edge here. But we can't put the driveway under the building because we have to lift the building up higher. We want to avoid that because of view preservation. The reason we have it on the left side is because we can start the ramp here, then it's going down the slope here. If we had the building cover it, the floor above the driveway at this point would have to be higher. Then that means every floor gets higher.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** The other thing I wanted to ask about is, at the garage level there is an internal span of 49 feet from north to south. Are there going to be any support columns in the garage area, or is that going to be one complete open space?

**Ms. Griffin:** We're going to have a support column. We haven't decided where it is. We're going to have very few, but we can't let the beam (off-mic). It's going to be unwieldy and expensive. So yes, once we land on a scheme we can very soon put the structure in there to make sure we account for that. OK?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** OK.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** From my perspective, I concur. I would support the direction of looking at coming up to the front property line, as you look into different schemes. I have a lot of problems with not providing setbacks from the side yards to all neighbors. You kind of avoided talking about that in the north side yard setback. But the existing building is down so we're looking at a lot, and you're coming in with two existing buildings on either side. I think kind of to make an orderly addition to the neighborhood we need to accommodate a decent side yard setback on all sides. I have a lot of problems with the 2 foot and change, or whatever, setback as well as things that are super close to that lot line. I think potentially we could have direction from the Board if they feel that should be the way we'd ask them to proceed, or not. That's my biggest problem.

There's going to be a list of information I think we'd like from you the next time you come around. What do you folks think about that? We should see a decent size like that from the north, as well?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** The only hesitation I have with what you say, Kathy, is that in certain parts of the Village there are these odd-shaped, angled lots like this, where it comes in on that side. I don't know how an architect deals with that sort of thing, but if you continually try to adapt to these odd lots, then you create odd buildings. I don't think, in the long term, that's what we think helps the Village terribly. That's the only hesitation I have of that. I mean, there's a way of angling the back of the building, but then you get an odd-looking building in back. That's my only hesitation with what you say. If there's some way in which we can work around that, there's no way you can move that building across if you keep to the current dimensions. The only way you could handle what you're saying, I think, is to reduce the width of the building.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Yeah, I think that's what I'm saying.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Yeah, that's what you are saying.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Or move 427 Warburton a couple of feet.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Jamie, hopefully – and I agree with him – I have one more thing to say. I think I'd like to come back to this conversation. The other thing I just want to share with the design team and the owner is, I contacted the county and spoke with the same gentleman that gave us some guidance on driveway widths. He said the county would look for a two-way driveway in this situation. Just to give you this information earlier than later, and just to let you know that's something we'll need to see.

Any comments from the public? If you are interested in speaking, say your name and where you live.

**John Seredinsky, 13 Division Street:** I've lived here for 49 years, I've owned the building for a little over 20 years. My main concern is the view preservation. I kind of got a little kick out of all the pictures there. My house directly overlooks this property, the building that they're talking about taking down. That's coming from the driveway in front of my house, it's not coming from my patio where I have a view of the river. In all these pictures I took a look at I didn't see any views of the river.

That building right there, I look over and I can see three-quarters of the Hudson. I can see the barges going up. Most people here who know me can testify to the fact that every weekend I'm out there looking at the barges, sitting on my patio. Like I said, what I found funny was, the last picture I saw – which said 13 Division Street – it didn't show any of that. OK, could you go to the last picture you kind of briefly mentioned – 13 Division Street – which is my property? That's not the view from my property.

All these pictures here, OK, that's the view just to the left of my patio. That's my driveway. You can see, where the concessions were made when the affordable housing buildings were put in, I kept some of my view. As you can see ... could you scroll back down a little? The building right there that you're talking about taking down – I'm sorry, go down a little – that's a building you're talking about taking down. Right over that building I have a beautiful view of the Hudson. The building that they're proposing of course is going to be much higher – I think 70 feet.

**Ms. Griffin:** It's 2 feet higher.

**Mr. Seredinsky:** Two feet higher?

**Ms. Griffin:** Yes.

**Mr. Seredinsky:** Right now, right from my patio, I get a picture of the river. Any addition in height I'm going to be losing that view. As I said, I just found all the pictures that were taken from Marble Terrace – which was to the south, Hogan Place which was to the north – but directly facing this property I didn't see any pictures like that.

**Ms. Griffin:** I'd like to do that.

**Mr. Seredensky:** I understand the community here, especially to the south and the north, has many, many issues, I am sure. But when you talk about view preservation, which is huge in Hastings – and again, that's why I love Hastings and why I've lived here my whole life, and try to continue to try to live here – it's because of that river. Any addition in height to that building I'm going to be losing my view.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Can I ask you a question?

**Mr. Seredensky:** Sure.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Those trees we're looking at behind the white (cross-talk) ...

**Mr. Seredensky:** The trees to the left?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** To the left there, are they evergreens?

**Mr. Seredensky:** They're not evergreens. So in the winter I get the view, in the spring I get the view. In the summers, you can see, I don't. But as you can see, like right over the actual building itself there are no trees there. I look right to the Hudson. That one to the right there is an evergreen so I don't have that. But right over that entire building there I get the Hudson. As I said, in the winter and spring, when the leaves are off those trees, I get the view there, too. So I'm going to be losing all that with any addition in height. Right now, I'm looking over the top of that building right at that level. That's where my patio is, that's where it sits. So besides the value of my house going down if I lose that, it's also my quality of life if I lose that view. Thank you.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Thank you very much, appreciate it.

**Michelle Noe, 20 Marble Terrace:** Hi. We're directly across the street from John, and I would say the exact same thing. I appreciate all the views you showed, but the 20 Marble Terrace view is standing on Marble Terrace. Our house is significantly elevated, and from three out of our four bedrooms – from our living room, our dining room – you see what John described, which is the river there. I actually think moving the building to the street line might help because we could sort of see more over the back of it. Because we're so elevated we might see more.

I just also have a comment about the approach on scheme B, which is try to make it look like townhouses. I think there's a significant apartment building across the street a little south of the park, and there's also the affordable housing across the street. I personally feel, to me, this looks a little like a mish-mash and an attempt to make something that would be flats

looking like townhouses, which kind of conflicts with one another. I have no objection to making it an attractive-looking small apartment building. I'm just saying that. It only has one entrance so it's sort of weird to have townhouses with only one entrance. Just going forward, I think that's not necessarily the optimum way to approach it.

The last piece is the roof. I don't think there have been any roof plans shown, nothing in this section. That really affects our view. When the affordable housing was built, that was a really important aspect of it, that geothermal heating and cooling so there's nothing on the roof. There's no HVAC or mechanicals. I don't know what you're intending but, to me, that would be really affecting the quality of our view. So those are my comments.

**Mr. Metzger:** Good evening. I'd like to ask the Board a quick question. Is the six-unit concept dead? Are we not discussing that, I'm hoping? The idea of putting six units on this property, I know that was something you had asked the applicant to do; to look at that, putting six units as opposed to the three they're proposing.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** My memory of a conversation of that was if they kept the existing building, we would be interested in seeing if they could do other units.

**Mr. Metzger:** I just wanted to make sure.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** No, that was my recollection. I was a little surprised. I don't think we said increase the number, but a conversation we had about the existing building and maybe adding to it.

**Mr. Metzger:** OK, thank you. I just wanted to make sure we weren't asking the applicant to increase the nonconformance of what they're asking for.

Christina was very gracious and came over to my house to take photographs, which I really appreciate. I invite any member of the Board that would like to come to my house, to my property, please feel free. While she was there, we had the opportunity to discuss the original scheme, which was the three townhouses. We talked about the possibility of doing horizontal floor plates instead of vertical floor plates. I've always felt that was a better solution. Looking at the plans they've come up with, I feel that gives us the greatest opportunity to reduce the amount of nonconformance of this project.

For all the reasons Jamie Cameron enumerated – gathering back the space within the units for the stairs – these things all will make, I believe, a better building. Having the elevator accessible to all three floors certainly will make a better building.

I don't personally have an issue coming out to the property line in the front. We happen to have a relatively wide sidewalk, which is an unusual thing in Hastings. The idea of showing some planting there or something I've always wanted to do, but understood it took an act of Congress to get the village to allow us to actually reduce the width of the sidewalk and put planting in. If we can accomplish that in this building it's a great idea.

Driveway north or south, I'm kind of in a toss-up situation about that. I have a driveway just to the north of my building and there is an issue with that driveway. It's not the cars going up and down, it's actually the lack of cars going up and down. When that project was done, about eight or 10 years ago, they required 10 parking spots for the units in the back of that building. The client complied with that. Those parking spots have never been used. The reason they've never been used is, that driveway is extraordinarily steep. As soon as you get even a heavy rain I hear the tires spinning as someone's trying to get out of that driveway. The people who have access to that parking will be parking on the street in inclement weather, and certainly during the winter.

When we have a situation like this – where, as Kathleen Sullivan said, the county may be requiring a two-way drive – we obviously don't have the width on the site for that. I don't know how you resolve that issue. But even if they were to allow a single lane they have here, the idea of somebody driving down that 15 percent grade in the winter and trying to make that U-turn to get into the garage – and once they're parked in the garage, parking front-in is not a problem – then backing out of that garage to be able to come back up the driveway I think is going to be a real problem. I don't envy Christina's job in trying to figure out how to access parking on this site. It's extraordinarily difficult because of the location and nonconformity we're dealing with here.

That being said, of course I am so wildly respectful of Christina's desire to hold the back edge of this new building at the point where the existing building is to not further impact the small amount of view I have of the river. So I really commend her on trying to do that, and I hope we can accomplish that. Of course, the side yard setback on the north side, I know they're not going to be able to comply with code. But I'd like to see them reduce the amount of variance they're asking for.

I'm looking at the size of the bedrooms, at 11.5 and 11.6 for the two smaller bedrooms. Those are certainly very large bedrooms for secondary bedrooms; they're about 12 square feet. Those could be reduced in size slightly. The kitchen/living room could probably be pulled over a couple of feet. Even if we picked up 2 or 3 feet, compressing the building from the north, it would reduce the amount of variance required and would increase the amount of open space on that side of the building.

I think we're really moving in the right direction. I appreciate the Board raising concerns I have and the community has. One of the reasons I think the driveway should probably stay in its current location, regardless of what happens with the building, it will increase – albeit in a small way – the view corridor from Marble Terrace and from the people coming down the hill on Division Street. Having that as the wider slot will give the greatest opportunity to the most number of people to maintain some small vision of the river as they go up and down. And I believe that's something this board should consider.

I said I think we're moving in the right direction. I appreciate the Board's comments. And I want to say again I really appreciate Christina's effort to try and reduce what was the original plan to something that is actually more acceptable to the community.

**Mark Desouza, 419 Warburton Avenue:** I own the building right next door. I'm just concerned about the driveway now, and the wall that's there is in real bad shape to hold this drywall up. Jim has a good point, I didn't think about it. Now the cars are going to be coming down, and that alleyway is active for my tenants to get to the back apartment and the laundry. Are they going to put a guardrail up? Because God forbid that car comes over now because now people are going to be walking there. And the buffer of trees, what they're going to do there for that. Those are my concerns.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Anyone else?

So, Board, what direction do you think we can give? What do you feel we should summarize to let these guys know what we'd like to see (off-mic)? You can express support for it, actually looking at the front yard setback that was on the front lot line if that's something in the direction that they choose we would support. We've given them information the county has given to us about the size of the driveway. So that needs to come back, showing the two-way access. Anything else we feel comfortable giving direction on, or any other setbacks?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I think with the absence of Richard Bass we felt very comfortable with the (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** He's on his way.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Sorry?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** He's on his way. He e-mailed.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** That we feel comfortable with the apartment scheme B, as we seem to be referring to it, as opposed to the townhouses.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Having one floor of apartments?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Right. One set of stairs, reducing the amount of stairs, and everybody having access to the elevator.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Do you want them to look at increasing that side yard setback?

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yeah. I think given the different layout, what they can do about the 3 foot 3 inch setback.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's actually 2.7.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** I have it written down.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** That was my goal, to sort of try to come up with (inaudible). We need some convincing about the side yard setback. We would like to see it increased, and therefore you need to show us what they're doing and why we should support it. Does that make sense?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Mm-hmm.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** You know, we understand there's a 12-foot code minimum, and then the increase required because of the building height. So we need to understand why you can't achieve that.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, my understanding – at least on part of the reason for the lack of setback on the north – is because of the space needed for the garages. But if the garages are basically below street level – fundamentally below street level – maybe we could allow the setback to be less at that level, then have a larger setback for the ground floor and above.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** That's correct. It's like making a bigger platform in the building mass.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Or maybe they could do something which, actually, Christina is famous for doing. That is, having it angled at the corner.



**Chairperson Sullivan:** We would like some thought about how not to make the garage the size of the building.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, yes. She already did that at the back on the south side, so we're looking now at the north side. That she may need to do it on the south side as well, the two-way driveway. I'm not an architect.

**Boardmember Cameron:** The two-way driveway is (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** You need to talk to the county.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** That's a toughie.

**Boardmember Cameron:** No kidding.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Yeah, I would suggest you talk to the county.

**Ms. Griffin:** I find that really hard. There are those townhouses that are not very far away near Washington Avenue – I don't know how many there are – that have a 9 foot 6 wide driveway, and that was approved by the county.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** But talk to the county.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I can give Buddy the name of the person I've spoken with and you can, of course, talk with them.

**Boardmember Cameron:** But I think what Michael just said is very important. They can have the garage the same size, but once you get above the garage level and all of it is underground you could then have a curbside or something to give us an increase (unintelligible).

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Light and air.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** And view.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Mr. Koch wants to speak.

**Mitch Koch, 20 Marble Terrace:** Forty-five Main has that exact same kind of setback above the garage area. They created like a little porch on the side elevation of the building. So that would completely work, and scheme B accommodates that very easily.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Thank you. So front yard setback discussion about the two-way access in the road. We appreciate that we have to be interested in the side yard setbacks. They need to be looked at, and an explanation of why and what they are. Anything else?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Get some pictures from Mr. Seredensky's Division ...

**Ms. Griffin:** I would like to make sure I get the address.

**Mr. Seredensky:** I'll take care of it for you.

**Ms. Griffin:** And also make sure we take those photographs.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I'm sure he'll let you take them from his patio.

**Ms. Noe:** I just want to say, from south 20 Marble Terrace, something really out of the box, which is that nobody uses the affordable housing parking. I mean, that is a massive amount of parking that was required that is not very attractive. Nobody uses it. I don't know if you would consider allowing fewer parking spot requirements for this project and somehow have some arrangement with the affordable housing. I don't know why nobody uses it. I don't know, maybe the people there don't have a lot of cars. But it's been how many years, five years that it's been there if not longer?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** It's been a pet peeve of this board for years.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You're pointing out why we have to have the elevator going to the garage, but nobody in the garage.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** But a garage is different, too. If people can put their cars indoors they're more likely to do it.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yes, I know.

**Ms. Noe:** (Off-mic). There's going to be more cars off the street because they're (off-mic) right now, and they don't have a real legal parking spot. Just a couple cars go inside.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** They kind of make a shift to the parking lot.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** The other folks who spoke about their views, I think we would like – probably, as a board – after the next go-round potentially, to come and see views from your

various spots. If that's OK, we'll wait this time. The gentleman who spoke about the patio, and Michelle about the different rooms in her house, and anyone else I think we'll just approach that later.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I think it's a good idea to have sort of the building outline set before you do that.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** The drawings I would like us to have are elevations of the building, site sections north-south and east-west. We need to see how the driveway works. And I'd like to see – especially to the gentleman, Mr. Desouza, who spoke about the retaining walls – retaining wall elevations so we understand those heights; what those look like, as well, just a really good description of what is going on. That involves also what's in the back, the retaining wall within the site that you're proposing for the garage driveway. Those are some things that would be helpful.

**Ms. Griffin:** We have a civil engineer (off-mic).

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I think, at this point, the next time you come back we need to understand these elevations. I don't know how that fits into who does what, but heights of the walls, bodies of the walls, what the sections are.

**Ms. Griffin:** Well, we can stick with the architectural part now – you know, take one at a time – the height discussion, before we bring in consultants.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** That would make sense to me.

**Ms. Griffin:** Do things to (off-mic) so we don't have to redraw it many times.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Or if you have that information ...

**Ms. Griffin:** (Off-mic).

**Chairperson Sullivan:** You can know where the top of wall is and the bottom of the wall, how long that wall is.

**Ms. Griffin:** Sure, yeah.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Thank you. Anything else people might need to see?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Just one question about the driveway again: the 15 percent gradient. I can't visualize 15 percent. I know probably Division Street is, what, 30 percent or 25 percent?

**Ms. Griffin:** I can get you the slopes of those streets – Division, and also the driveway that Jim Metzger mentioned -- which I think is like 20 percent, just so you can compare.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** OK. Also with the driveway itself ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Christina, do you want to get up and talk into the other mic?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** You might use that one.

If you were visualizing your plan for the driveway, is there a flat spot and then a gradient? Because if you're coming up out of the driveway, the point raised is that if you have to scream up to get to the point and come straight out onto the street off the 15 percent grade, that's my question.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** On the sidewalk?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** You have the width of the sidewalk.

**Ms. Griffin:** The 3 percent at the front sidewalk, we have ... you know, there's all these cars parked here so probably you would turn in. And we have, from the sidewalk in, this 13 foot 8 at 3 percent. Then we go down 15.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Once you're off the sidewalk, you'd be on 15 percent.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** They usually have to come up with another transitional slope at the top to the bottom.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Well, that's one of the variances. Your code actually requires that the 3 percent has to extend for 30 feet into the site. So that is one of the listed variances, but that's I think definitely something you need to look at. Because the idea is that you're not coming in and immediately dropping down; that you have a flat pad at the top.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So we'll see a section, hopefully, and really be able to understand it.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** To address the issue that Jim Metzger points out that people's tires spin, especially if the driveway is made out of concrete, which I trust it would be ...

**Ms. Griffin:** Now, we should talk some kind of textured driveway.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Right, right. Corrugated.

**Ms. Griffin:** Yeah, something.

**Mr. Metzger:** Michael, I appreciate that. The only issue with doing a corrugated driveway is, in the winter those corrugations hold water. And when they freeze, it's impossible to clean them out.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** But you can do them in a V design.

**Mr. Metzger:** It needs something, it needs to be looked at. I said it's been a nightmare for my neighbors on the other side. I just want to make sure we don't have that same issue here. But thank you for bringing that up.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I'm sure when you get the engineer in ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yeah, the engineer. Yes, yes.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** ... and have the engineers look at it, they'll (cross-talk) ...

**Ms. Griffin:** Exactly. We'll look at it. You know, we have done a lot of projects with radiant heat, too, under driveways. So we'll see.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Under driveways, yes.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** OK, everyone feels we've given some direction and we're ready to thank you for your presentation.

**Ms. Griffin:** Thank you so much for your time.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** OK, the night is still young.

#### **IV. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS – None**

## **V. NEW BUSINESS – None**

## **VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **1. 196 Warburton Avenue – Proposed Subdivision**

**Chairperson Sullivan:** We have no old public hearings and no new business, but we do have a couple of discussion items.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Excuse me, Buddy, did you get a copy of this for Eva?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** No, I didn't but I'll get one tomorrow.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Hello. Introduce yourself, gentlemen.

**Tomasz Lopinski, associate – TLConcept LLC:** I'm the project architect for this subdivision project. This presentation will be more like introduction to the subdivision.

**Dean Wetherell, Applicant:** Good evening. I had no idea that Warburton Avenue would be such a hot topic tonight. But I'll just give you a really brief summary of what my wife's and my thinking is about this lot. We feel, because of its size and its location that at some point in the future someone will no doubt make an effort to put a house there. We feel that if that's the case we might as well investigate it ourselves. We have been paying taxes on it all these years, we might as well check it out. So we want to just open a dialogue and see if it's feasible.

We also think we're pretty well suited to doing the job since we've been living in Hastings for the last 20 years and have a couple of kids who graduated from Hastings High School. We like the community, and I think whatever we put up there – what we plan on putting up there – will be a compliment to our house. I think it will fit in nicely in the neighborhood. That's pretty much our thinking.

Also, Tomasz Lopinski was ... we've already done a rather large project there about 10 years ago, right at our house. Tomasz designed and built a rather large addition on the ground floor of our house at 196 Warburton Avenue so we've already had a successful major disruption in that area of Warburton Avenue. I figure Tomasz could do it again. That's it.

**Mr. Lopinski:** Let me give you details on this proposal. I mean, we have ... currently, the lot is in R-10 zone. The lot is ... as we know, the R-10 zone requires a lot to be 10,000 square feet, right? Currently the lot is 2,200 square feet. We're thinking there is plenty of space on the north side so we're thinking that we can re-subdivide it and develop a residence. We think we should be able to meet all the zoning requirements, except the lot width. That our proposal is to be less than 100 feet, right? And the question is, how far this is from the spirit of the neighborhood. We know there are some lots that are 100 feet wide or wider. Some are narrower, some of them are even 50 feet wide. The question is whether ... what do you think about this idea, and whether you would give us a recommendation to Zoning Board or what would be next step for this kind of project, or direction.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So what you've done is, you have a lot at 150 feet or so below street level. That's the existing ... when you put those two lots together, they're 150 feet?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** One-hundred-sixty.

**Mr. Lopinski:** No, 159. Yes, that's the frontage of the street.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So you've taken a lot that's about 160 square feet, and then you're creating two lots which are around 182 and change; the other one is 76.

**Mr. Lopinski:** Right.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So those two lots are such that they do not have 100-foot widths.

**Mr. Lopinski:** No, they don't.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Then as you go back onto the lot to the north, it narrows down to 0.758-ish. Is that correct, 57.9?

**Mr. Lopinski:** Frontage or width of the lot?

**Chairperson Sullivan:** It looks like the narrowest point of the lot goes down to 57 feet in 169.

**Mr. Lopinski:** Correct.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I think you had, in your drawings, mentioned that you were looking at a part of the code that said you couldn't have 70 percent of the frontage on the street as

acceptable. That is where you're ... that's part of your argument for this, right? That that applies, and you don't need the 100-foot width at that point?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** The 100-foot width is measured ... it's not measured at the frontage. Lot width is measured ... it's either an average or it's measured at the front yard setback line. A hundred feet is required (cross-talk) ...

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** You're saying of the lot width.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So, Linda, you're saying at the front yard setbacks it needs to be 100 feet.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Right, and it's not.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** And it's not.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** And that's where they've acknowledged they need the variance.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** OK.

**Boardmember Cameron:** (Off-mic).

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's really not two lots now, it's two tax lots.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** And one tax lot, 18, is 40,700 square feet; lot 70 is 7,181 square feet?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** But for zoning purposes, they're one lot.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** But they're proposing two lots.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Right, they're proposing to subdivide it.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Right, they're proposing two *building* lots. Right now they're (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** They need a variance for lot width for each lot.



**Mr. Lopinski:** Right.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Basically breaking it down the middle.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Excuse me. Is width on the area?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Correct. The two lots are both over 10,000 square feet.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** And that's based on the depth of the lot.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Right, it's because the lot is deep. That's why they can have the area, but not in the frontage or the width. It's due to the shape of the lot.

**Boardmember Cameron:** If you want to talk steep, (off-mic).

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Maybe start from Michael's side. Any questions?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, just looking ... and this is ... you're proposing a building area that is going to put in quite a substantial amount of impermeable surface area. You're talking about using existing open drainage. I think you need to consider ... certainly, when it comes time to approving any building application we'll be looking at remediation for impermeable surface. I don't know if you want to consider, at this time, addressing that. I don't think there's any requirement to do it, but it's something that concerns me in the long term if you're talking about making this a buildable lot. It's certainly easier to do before you put the building in, or as part of putting in that building.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I think before you would actually approve (cross-talk) ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** But it's just a discussion item. Before you would approve the subdivision they would have to show you that they can accommodate the stormwater runoff from a house on the new lot.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** In other words, do you have ... is there ground area to absorb the runoff?

**Mr. Lopinski:** Yes, we have investigated this actually and consulted this with our civil engineer, Paul Petretti, who's present here. Maybe he can speak for this, a couple of words, what he found there and ...

**Paul Petretti, civil engineer:** Either one. I'm an engineer and surveyor from Dobbs Ferry. One of the biggest issues with this lot, OK, is that this lot ... OK, maybe I'll go up here and walk over here. I don't know how familiar you are with the Aqueduct. Maybe a lot of you guys walk it on occasion. But you're going to find U-shaped (off-mic) drains.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** You have to hold the mic to your mouth.

**Mr. Petretti:** Drainage is going to be a challenge. It's good that we speak about it now. We have a video. They're U-shaped, they're very unique, and I've seen them along the Aqueduct many times. As the Aqueduct runs north-south, basically – north-south bias – there's generally, on the upside, a channel very prevalent along the whole Aqueduct. That water collects. So we have a video of how much water's coming through here. It was taken in a major rainstorm, and it is a lot of water.

All our water came down through here. When I started looking at this, I was a little confused as to where the water was going. We found a 12-inch diameter pipe down here in this little depression. There's a wall here, and there's a depression here. This section of this piece of property's been catching that water for a long time, ever since the Aqueduct was built. I thought there was a catchbasin over here, and that drain line would go to that catchbasin and then go across the street because there was a catchbasin on the opposite side of the street.

You go to this catchbasin, you look in there and you see, Oh, I don't see a drain line coming into it. I see a drain line coming out of here, I don't see one coming in here. What we did is, we went on the other side of the road and pulled a manhole cover. We put a hose in here and we let it run, and let it run, run, run, run, run. We didn't see any water for a long time because this thing's about 22 foot deep.

Interesting enough, when they built Warburton Avenue every once in awhile there was a (off-mic). This apparently was a ravine because there's a wall on the other side. That wall goes down about 22 feet; it's a massive wall. Down at the bottom was a channel, and that channel was dry at the time. Then we put the hose in it, and about 10 minutes later lo and behold the water showed up. All this water ... and I think we should show you that video sometime. The impervious area is one issue, but the bigger issue is a torrential amount of water is going to come down through here; it would have to come through here. Apparently, that drain line is large enough to convey that water, even though it's a lot of water. It eventually goes across there.

I can understand the whole issue about impervious area, but the amount of runoff from this house that could be built here is a fraction of what's coming down. If you were to try to take ... and somehow, some way, we're going to have to pipe this water down through here and get it into that drain line so it will go across the street. In terms of the impervious area that this would generate, I think it's very hard to hold on to that water, especially when you have all this water coming through. Again, we should show you that video. It's kind of impractical to hold the water. You're going down through a giant ravine which has more than adequate hydraulic capacity to take not only this torrent that comes down here, but the fractional part of the water that would be contributed.

You could try drywells. It's a little dicey trying to do that, especially when you have his whole area, OK? You have this water coming down, and you have this water's coming down here so it's a little dicey trying to put drywells in. You could try to put in some kind of stormwater detention system, but you would have to bypass all this water. Otherwise, it would fill up like that. That's the issue with the drainage on this piece of property.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I actually went and peered over the wall down there, and it looks like there's a considerable amount of runoff that comes through that pipe. You can see all the stones, like there's a bottom of a small stream and logs and everything else down there. So I understand it won't stop. What I'm more concerned about is how you're going to catch it coming down that hill before it gets to the house. That, to me, is the issue.

**Mr. Petretti:** That *is* the issue. This is a discharge that's huge. You're going to have to put a headwall up it. So far, there's a little path of erosion coming down through there. You would think there would be more with the amount of water that comes through there, but apparently it's pretty stable. So you could bring the channel through here, and then you're going to have to catch it with a headwall with a good-sized piece of pipe in it. Probably larger than you need for the capacity because you wouldn't want a small pipe because it would then clog. Then you can bring the water down through here.

I think the best observation is that, in time, this has never clogged. That pipe is very deep because there's a manhole on the other side of the street that if you take the cover off and look down you go, Whoa, it's steep. We can handle the water coming through. It's not easy, but you can do it.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** But I think what we would be looking at in terms of any construction would be abatement of that additional impervious area.

**Mr. Petretti:** Not easy to do, but you can do it. (Off-mic) of tankage in there.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, then you also have to do a geology test to see whether the soil will allow it.

**Mr. Petretti:** Yeah. Well, we could do a test bit.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I'm just bringing this up for you before you proceed with the subdivision and have issues about trying to build anything.

**Mr. Petretti:** OK.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I went and peered around the property for awhile, as I'm wont to do. It's actually a really deep depression right there, and there is a wall right on the east side of Warburton; a beautifully built piece of stone wall. It seems to me your driveway and everything else, you're going to have to fill all that in. If the water gets by the building without going into your trench inlet it's got a real problem. In order for these two houses to work you're going to have to somehow bring the proposed new house up to a higher level. Because, quite frankly, this piece of land is 6 or 7 feet below, and then the other house has a garage next to it and a patio which is another 10 feet up. It's like a dwarf and a very nice-looking gully. (Inaudible), I'll bring it up to you.

**Mr. Petretti:** Yeah, you have that. You're going in the right ... you're correct on that. This is a depression. So if you have a driveway over here, about the only thing you could do is put a drywell underneath the driveway. Put the water in, OK, from our roof leaders and gutters in, in that driveway, into that drive. Then that would have to overflow, if the capacity is exceeded, into that same drain line. I think you could do this by open channel.

Just about over here you're going to have to have a headwall (inaudible) high so it would catch it all, and a pretty good-sized pipe. With that slope, you could probably do it with a 15-inch pipe, come down through here, and then put a drywell over here. I think you'd have to fill this, and I think there's some limitations with the height. But I'm not the architect. I don't know how you get that all to work, but you can get the drainage to work.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Bill, do you have any comments?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** No. I looked at the property this afternoon and walked into that area where, as you say, I was surprised that over the years there it hadn't created a ravine. But it is a shallow ... it's a depressed side of the property which, I think, does raise a question as to how the basement of that place would be built there in such an area. Obviously it's lower down than the existing house.

**Mr. Petretti:** Yeah, that pipe is right about in here.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right.

**Mr. Petretti:** It's a 12-inch pipe.

**Mr. Lopinski:** Actually, it's 16 inches.

**Mr. Petretti:** So it's pretty good good-sized. Evidently somebody had that, many, many years ago, figured out properly.

**Boardmember Cameron:** It's draining that basin.

**Mr. Petretti:** Say again?

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right now, the water runs into that basin and gets drained out.

**Mr. Lopinski:** Correct.

**Mr. Petretti:** It'll fill up that basin, hit that pipe, and go away.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Kerry, do you have any questions, comments?

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** I don't.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** For me alone, I just wondered about the ... you know, you're looking for a variance for the lot width, and it seems that really the narrowest point is the width that you are looking for the variance – the 57.69 – for lot A, then 66.90. That seems like a lot. It's about half of what you should have. I think Linda can help with this. When we do a subdivision, or a re-subdivision, our first mandate is to ensure the lots that are created are compliant. Now we're creating two lots are (inaudible).

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Well, once they get a variance then, technically, they're compliant.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I know what you're saying, but we have to look at the amount of variance.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Are you looking at this lot right back here?

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Yes.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** OK, but that's not where you measure it. You measure it at (background noise).

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** This particular lot, I think you have to do an average because it doesn't meet the 100 setback line.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Yeah, it's either way. It doesn't really say what you get so you take an average of the whole lot. It's an irregular-shaped lot so you're ...

**Boardmember Cameron:** But at this setback line, the present one, it's only 82.7 feet, unless I'm misreading the dividing line.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** That's at the street line.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yeah, but it's also the same going back. If you just go back (inaudible). But 100.3 is misleading because that's actually tax lot B.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Yeah, but they show both.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yeah, I know, but the other one's 82.75.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So if you look at the minimum lot widths in the chart, they're proposed. Lot B they're showing ...

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** So neither one would have sufficient ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Correct, they'd all need a variance.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** So what's the number 0.3?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Well, that's the existing tax lot.

**Boardmember Cameron:** That's tax lot B. That's this one.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's tax lot 18. It's the existing tax lot line. Ignore those.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Right, so it becomes 82.7.

**Boardmember Cameron:** That's right.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Ignore the existing tax lot.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** All right, I see. Right.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So tax lots ... a new lot B is 82.75 feet.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** For most of the lot, yeah. The average comes out to a little less because it angles in the back.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So the average is the ... I think the thing I personally have to see – and Tomasz mentioned it at the beginning – is how these buildings relate to the neighbors. You know, is this a similar (cross-talk) ...

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** How they relate to what?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** The neighbors.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Relate to the neighbors. You know, is it going ... is the kind of spacing you have between the buildings – the proposed building and the existing one, and the proposed building and its neighbor to the north – is that something that is fitting into this area of Warburton? That would be important to understand.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** They're compliant with the side yard setbacks, and that's really your spacing.

**Mr. Lopinski:** My thinking was that these proposed lots would kind of follow the pattern of the street and neighborhood because that's the neighborhood view. There's really not many lots that are (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I think that's the point. Can you provide information on the lot widths of the other lots to show this is consistent with what's there? Right? You want the lot widths of the other lots.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Because it's Hastings, so nothing follows the zoning code. But the point is, if you decide to come back it would be helpful to have an analysis of the

neighborhood around it showing us the widths of the lots because they may or may not be (inaudible) feed. If you have a bunch of 100-feeders, and you're proposing lots that are less than that, then that's what we want to know; if, to your advantage, would be that the lots are less than 100 and these new lots fit in quite well. I mean, the point that they're accommodating the setbacks is true, but if everyone else is 100-foot lot, and these setbacks are greater than that, then we'll understand that these buildings (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** No, I think you need to know the widths of the lots.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** And to be honest with you, it's not like this is ... Warburton varies so much that the area around you can analyze. You can probably safely say it would be, potentially, 20 lots on either side.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's really the ones you're showing there.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Yeah, because that's after the break.

**Boardmember Cameron:** The other thing I think we really need to see is, we need to see that video of it flooding.

**Mr. Petretti:** Yeah, I think I'd like to come back with that. Just generically, I'd like to speak to the issue. Warburton Avenue over here, this lot's less than 100. So it's a mix.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Right, that's what they're asking.

**Mr. Petretti:** That's Hastings, OK.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** And that's what we're asking. I think, to be honest with you, that's what the Zoning Board's going to be asking, as well.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Right. You're going to have to show the Zoning Board that to get the variance.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So let's take a look at it when you come back again.

**Mr. Petretti:** Right.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I think the other issue discussed, and it's a little ... if this is a depression that's been used for a long time to handle a certain amount of runoff, it's basically



a retaining pond (inaudible). So putting a new building in that area, I mean, the question about what type of soil, it's that very lovely mud that absorbs water.

**[Male Voice]:** It's actually not a pond (off-mic). I just wanted to quickly point out that it's really not a pond. The water just channels to this 18-inch pipe like, whoosh, like that. There's no pond. It's like out the door, see you later, goodbye. There's no pond.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** But there's still an issue for building.

**[Male Voice]:** Right.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** You know, whether it's a driveway or the basement of a structure there still would be substantial issues.

**[Male Voice]:** No, absolutely understood. I just (cross-talk) ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Because the other thing is, if you're going to try to use that to try to build a catchbasin, a drywell or whatever it may be, you need to know what the material is made of.

**[Male Voice]:** Yes, of course. Of course, absolutely. It's just this idea of a pond conjures up a vision of a pond, and there's no pond there. The water just goes straight down the pipe, whoosh, good-bye.

**Boardmember Cameron:** (Off-mic).

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** As a suggestion, maybe you consider building further back in that lot; in what is it, lot A?

**Mr. Petretti:** That's pretty interesting because (cross-talk) ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** But I know that you've got a steep slope there.

**Mr. Lopinski:** Right. That's (cross-talk) ...

**Mr. Petretti:** We were trying to not go up on the steep slope. I think if you measure building up front and building in the back, I think building in the back on the steep slope like contradicts the whole philosophy to steep slope. I have no reservations about being able to deal with the water, OK. I can sneak a little drywell in here; it would have to have an overflow.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Mm-hmm.

**Mr. Petretti:** I don't think I would want ... and then, of course you know, the footing drain for this house ... so let's really go into this a little deeper now.

**Mr. Lopinski:** No basement. There will be no basement; no basement.

**Mr. Petretti:** No, you can't have a basement because you can't drain the basement. Because this elevation in here – this is 101 (cross-talk) ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** It's lower.

**Mr. Petretti:** It's 96. So that invert of that pipe is 96. It's hard to see, but it is 96. That's the limiting. Let's assume the pipe is at elevation 96. That's how the water exits the site. And there is a wall over here, so if you came up and you want the driveway to pitch out to the street, you'd want the ... this is 99, about 100, OK. So you want this to be 101, and that would be the garage level. You wouldn't have any basement levels. At 101 and 96 you could have a crawl space of about 4 feet, and that's about it. Then you have to deal with the height. I just don't think pushing it too far up the slope is a good idea.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** All right. So any other comments, folks, for now? I hope that as helpful.

**Mr. Petretti:** It was, thanks.

**Mr. Lopinski:** Thank you.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Good, thank you very much.

## **2. 10 West Main Street – Proposed Multi-Family Residential Facility Land Use Approval Task Force – Definitions (Continued)**

**Chairperson Sullivan:** One more discussion item for this evening. This is for 10 West Main, the proposed multi-family residential facility. I'll let you know that Buddy and I have met with these particular people. The architect is here to present, as well as some other folks. We can talk about that (inaudible).

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Richard did our homework.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** The land use definitions.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Richard did our homework and he sent it (inaudible). I'm giving you credit where credit is due, but I don't think we're going to get to it tonight.

**Boardmember Cameron:** (Off-mic).

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Richard and I were supposed to work together so he sent me this today.

**Boardmember Bass:** It's been a busy month.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Hey, you did way more than I did.

**[Male Voice]:** I don't know if you guys are baseball fans, but I have some good news and the Cubs are winning tonight.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Oh, good.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** My grandmother would be happy.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So if you could introduce into the mic.

**Matthew Cordone, project architect:** Oh, very good. Audio and visual. This is nice.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's really for the transcriptionist who does the minutes.

**Mr. Cordone:** Well, that's good. I'll use this one.

**Mr. Cordone:** I've been retained by NFW LLC to prepare a potential new housing project for 10 West Main Street. I know in the past there have been a few designs that have come up to present to you guys, and some of them have been a little bit more aggressive than others. Our presentation tonight is a very modest, in my eyes, housing project. The concept is that we retain the existing property on 10 West Main Street, which is a two-story, four-family structure. On the remaining property, we add six new units on a three-story structure. Our goal is to try to maintain an urban fabric within the street, and also not to (sorry, it's been a long night) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** For you?

**Mr. Cordone:** I'm dozing off here. And not to create any type of disturbance to the views of the river from where we are. So with that being said, I just want to walk you through the property. The first floor is basically located right next to the existing property. Let me give you guys some context first in terms of elevation and where we are at. If you look at the site plan you'll see that we have the existing property here, which is a two-story structure. Then we have the new three-story, six-unit apartment building that we want to build here. There are existing retaining walls that exist around the property itself, and also this staircase that takes you down to the train station and the lower area of downtown.

The proposal will include reinforcing and rebuilding the retaining walls and also rebuilding these stairs as well to create a nicer approach to the building. We do accommodate for all the new parking on our property. We do have 17 parking spots, as per zoning mandate. And we basically add six new units: three 2-bedrooms and three 1-bedrooms into this building, which would add to the existing two 4-bedroom apartments on the two-story structure next door. The idea, again, is to kind of maintain an urban fabric within the street, and also not to destroy any of the views or any of the pleasures of having the wooded area that kind of surrounds the train station and the approach up to Warburton Avenue.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** (Off-mic) and all that stuff that we did the other day.

**Mr. Cordone:** Oh, that's true too. Prior to this, about two weeks ago, we had a conversation with Westchester County. They are very interested in this project. We are proposing to have some low-income housing on this property. We're thinking (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Affordable housing.

**Mr. Cordone:** Affordable housing – sorry, not low-income – which would be five units. So they split; five units of affordable housing and then five units of market rate. The existing property itself, we are planning on using this as our affordable housing. We are in the process of working with the county to come up with a budget to restore this as general upgrades and rehabilitation for the property; not changing the function of it, not changing the aesthetic of it, just upgrading the apartments. And in addition to that, once that is complete we'd like to move into the new structure and build that from ground up to have our total of 10 units.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** And you're still thinking of having one additional affordable unit in the new structure, or has that changed?

**Mr. Cordone:** No, that's correct. One additional affordable unit in the new structure. There'd be six total in the new structure; one affordable, and then five would be market rate. Then four existing in the two-story residential would be affordable.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** What's interesting, your drawings came without a cover letter. I think, in the future, that we need a cover letter of some type.

**Mr. Cordone:** I apologize for that.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** No. Just it would have given people context, that's all. But thank you.

**Mr. Cordone:** One of the limits we have with this project is, we are in a downtown district. The zoning mandate calls for mixed-use in the downtown district so we are basically forced to have a mixed-use facility if we were to build new as a brand-new construction.

Unfortunately, because this is existing two-story residential and we want two additional residential we're kind of in a quagmire. We don't want to do commercial in this area. We don't think commercial makes sense because we're so far away from any real street access, pedestrian access. The other issue with that is we don't want to change the C of O of the existing structure. If we had to change, if we had to go to mixed-use, then we'd have to apply for a new C of O for the entire property. We'd rather not do that, we'd rather just stick with residential and maintain the street integrity of residential.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So I think the issue is, then, the CC district and central district allow residential in a mixed-use building.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** And the property is an existing nonconforming because it's only residential.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Right.

**Mr. Cordone:** Right.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** So in essence, you're extending the nonconformity and putting more residential.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** But if you look at all the existing buildings at that end of Main Street, they're all existing nonconforming. It's sort of a situation where that makes (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's bad.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** ... you would make it bad to try to put in commercial.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I think in the code, we can, as a planning board – just to what Michael said – this is an existing area with residential and we feel all residential would be a valid addition. I think we have that.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** You know, there's no different uses on one lot and that would keep away one variance because he is going with the same use. It is the same lot, so really it's not a use variance I don't believe. I believe it's what Linda just mentioned, it's an extension of a preexisting nonconformity.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** And I think there's just a greater perspective, sort of in a planning perspective. It just makes sense not to (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** We have to look at how we can interpret it.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Yes.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I mean, residential is not a permitted use in the zone. Really, this section shouldn't be zoned CC.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Right, right.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** You know, this West Main Street section is all residential.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Four or five houses that are here, yeah.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Right.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** And then get the two up on the other side.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** These are all existing nonconforming. So residential use isn't permitted unless it's in a mixed-use building. So, yeah, we have to look at how we classify it.

**Boardmember Bass:** I have some design questions. The first floor treatment – the northern treatment, which is the more public treatment – violates the intent of the Comprehensive Plan

to activate that street wall. Your first floor plan has mailboxes, a mailroom, and a gas meter room. There's no residential use.

**Mr. Cordone:** Oh, I can clarify that. The main entry to the building is off this double door here, this entry here, bringing you into the main area of the building that gets you into the apartments. These are the mailboxes.

**Boardmember Bass:** Right. But if I'm walking to those stairs, what's my pedestrian experience?

**Mr. Cordone:** Coming down here?

**Boardmember Bass:** Yeah. I'm walking to the train, I'm walking on Main Street.

**Mr. Cordone:** As you come down here, you experience the new portico, or veranda, and the main entry which is articulated with a glass double door for the residents. This door here is more or less a convenience door, celebrated for the mailroom. This would allow the mailman keyed access to get into the building. But the idea here is that we focus on this corner and then the veranda does help bring people through and understand that this is, in fact, the residential portion of the building.

**Boardmember Bass:** Right. I fully understand your proposed uses. I disagree with them. The other buildings have residential uses on the ground floor. They have real people looking out those windows. You have a dead space in terms of an experience. I think that violates the Comp Plan, which calls for activating that street frontage. That's my problem, one.

The existing tenants in the existing building, do you know what their income levels are? Are they affordable? Are you displacing them to bring in other affordable tenants?

**Mr. Cordone:** That's something that'll have to be reviewed with ownership. My understanding is that there's a potential that the existing tenants are, in fact, applicable for affordable housing and we do want to leave them there. But I do not know that off the top of my head. I'd have to rely on the ownership to give you that answer.

**Boardmember Bass:** I think that's important public policy for this board and for the Village. Because it really makes no public policy sense if we displace one set of affordable residents to replace them with another.

The façade treatment. When you look at the other buildings, they have vertical treatments. This is a minor point, but I would urge that you break up that façade and just have two vertical lines so you have more of that Village rhythm as opposed to a wide façade.

Then the real tricky one is, what's your projected cost on the parking project for the 17 parking spaces?

**Mr. Cordone:** That's a very good question. I don't think we're at that point right now. I'd have to talk to my construction management team whose putting the numbers together for the projected cost.

**Boardmember Bass:** Because when I saw this at a presentation, an earlier version at the Rec Center, parking was the tail that was wagging this dog. I know the parking is required. And you meet that so you don't have any variances, but you're right next to a parking lot and you're right above another parking lot. We're having parking drive the urban design of this kind of unique and difficult site. So I'd like to know the delta of what the cost of parking/no parking would be because maybe we come up with an alternative in terms of providing parking for the site either in our parking lot or we come up with another proposal to expand the parking lot and deck over the Con Ed parking so we have more parking in the downtown.

Parking is the tail that's wagging this dog. And I compliment you for coming with a good design solution, but I think if you had a different alternative where parking wasn't provided on-site, or limited parking was provided on-site, you would have a better residential development.

**Mr. Cordone:** Well, we would certainly embrace that, absolutely. You're right. One of the main drivers is how are we going to put these parking spots on this property. A lot of it would have to do with building retaining walls and doing a little re-grading to make sure it's applicable to have this type of parking. If the town is interested in having a conversation with us in terms of remote parking and off-site parking we'd be more than happy to do that.

**Boardmember Bass:** I think if you provide us with more information we could have that type of dialogue. I can't speak for the Village, but the other houses on West Main Street don't have parking – a lot of them don't have parking – and they have thrived, and people are very comfortable. They either park on the street or they park in the lots.

I think let's be more creative. I want you to be a progressive architect and come up with a better design solution, and not have parking wag the dog.

**Mr. Cordone:** OK.



**Village Attorney Whitehead:** There seems to be a conflict between the Comp Plan and the zoning code.

**Boardmember Bass:** I understand that.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Because the zoning code actually says this board has the authority to permit residential uses on the ground floor, but only if they're not on the street frontage.

**Mr. Cordone:** Which is ... I just was trying to be polite.

**Boardmember Bass:** This is just one more example of where the zoning code doesn't make sense. But the Comp Plan looked at this as a pedestrian experience. I walk that to the train station. I would like to have that as an active pedestrian experience, having a blank wall. You've decorated it so it looks like a real wall, but there's really no eyes behind that wall. I think that goes against the vision of the Comp Plan that tried to activate that as a pedestrian thoroughway.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Well, unfortunately the zoning doesn't allow for that. What really needs to be done is, the zoning for that probably needs to be changed.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I would hope that is something we could have as a variance; that that type of use does change.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Richard, I tend to disagree with you on that. If I look at the site plan, you're halfway down the stairs before you're even past this building. You're not walking past this building. The steps take you away.

**Boardmember Bass:** Actually, the building is set back a little bit from the stairs. But if you're still having that experience, again going back to last month, what are we really ... what's the best site plan we have here, what do we want to accomplish. We're going to need variances or amendments to the zoning code. But I'd like to back into ... you know, especially if we're going to do 50 percent affordable housing, let's make it best affordable housing and not have us tied into knots because our zoning code is clunky.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I think, Richard, there is a way we can solve this or provide suggestions. There is a duplex – the entrance for the bottom of a duplex – on this level. Maybe the duplex is moved from being at back of the building where the views are not

particularly attractive. Being a parking area to being at the front where it's more appropriate, you would need to have the door into the duplex coming in from that patio from the porch.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Instead of the side.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You could walk down the road, which could be like a pathway.

I actually have a question about these cars back here, the 11 cars. Because after you go about 75 feet into this lot – and I did pace it off – you drop like a rock heading down towards the parking lot below.

**Mr. Cordone:** Yes.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Hence the retaining wall.

**Boardmember Cameron:** So from the other viewpoint – I was (inaudible) before – you're going to have something partly resembling Hoover Dam holding up those 11 cars.

**Mr. Cordone:** I like to think of it more about how Riverside Drive dealt with The Cliffs, which is (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Because it collapsed.

**Mr. Cordone:** Yeah, that collapsed.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Yeah.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Anyway, it's just ... you know, you come here for feedback. And I worry about what that's going to look like from down below. Maybe there's another reason to have less cars, but strangely enough you're taking the best part of your lot, you're covering it with cars. Or second-best – the best is probably looking at the Palisades – I agree with moving the duplex or moving housing to the front side of the building and making it look like it actually is a house.

**Mr. Cordone:** My charge with this design was to have it fit within zoning. The challenge is working with the zoning laws, and I'd be more than happy to apply with a variance. I think maybe moving the duplex to the front is a great idea. I think one of the things that my drawing is lacking is contours on the site plan. The contours should certainly also give you a little bit more insight in terms of how those stairs interface with that front façade. But by all

means, if we have the opportunity of bringing more interface and eyes on the street I will embrace it.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** One other. With regard to the bicycle port, is that going to be basically an open area, or do you plan to have that enclosed so it can be locked up? I mean, I love the idea of providing all that space for bicycles because I'd like to encourage people riding bicycles. However, unfortunately bicycles tend to attract other people to want them.

**Mr. Cordone:** Well, you know, the goal would be to have a security system. It would be placed under the building, inside a secured area. Currently this drawing, diagrammatically, just shows it as open space to allow for free access to the bicycles. But obviously, if these bicycles are for the people who live in this building they will be secured properly.

Now, another option we could talk about in terms of these bicycles is, maybe these aren't bicycles that are just for the people who live here. Maybe these are bicycles that are for the town. Maybe I can solve my commercial dilemma with bicycle rental.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Bike rental.

**Mr. Cordone:** And it's something we could think about.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** You're going to bring Citi Bike to Hastings?

**Mr. Cordone:** I really don't want to ... I'm a Nutmegger, I'm from Connecticut. I'd want to stay away from New York City.

**Boardmember Cameron:** But you could move the duplex apartment up there, and you could give them their very long porch as you go down the stairs where the bicycles are and move the bicycles to the back. That's probably a way of making it even more ... sorry, go ahead.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** No, that's all right. Back to Rich's point about the appearance of walking through, one of things I've always liked about this area – and you can see this picture in the corner – the houses along there have the small fences in front of them.

**Mr. Cordone:** The picket fence, right.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** And even the one you're going to renovate has a brick rise (cross-talk) ...

**Mr. Cordone:** And a center box, yes.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** And that would be nice if that could be continued along. I think that would (cross-talk) ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Tie it all together.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Yeah.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Yeah, I agree with that.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Or get rid of the brick riser (inaudible).

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Yeah. It'd be good if you had the chance to do that.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Preferably not in plastic.

**Mr. Cordone:** Prefer something that is not "melty".

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** You have a mailroom for the mailmen to come in and deliver mail, 120 square feet, but then you've got another mailroom of 100 square feet completely internal to the building.

**Mr. Cordone:** Oh yeah, and I apologize. That is a typo. That should be the laundry room for the building.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Ah, that makes more sense.

**Mr. Cordone:** Mm-hmm.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, that's why those big machines were there.

**Mr. Cordone:** And that's also where we've got a slop sink in there. I know mailmen get dirty from time to time, but ...

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Laundry.

**Boardmember Bass:** If you could activate the front of the building so it has (cross-talk) ...

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** What did you say, Richard? If you could what?

**Boardmember Bass:** "Activate" the front of the building in the same fashion as the other buildings on the street, both from a use point of view ... and here, let me give you my plans I've sketched.

**Mr. Cordone:** Change the zoning and I'll do it for you.

**Boardmember Bass:** I really wanted to come tonight.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I think that's why you showed up.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Yeah, exactly.

**Boardmember Bass:** Again, you wanted feedback.

**Mr. Cordone:** I really appreciate it. I came really late on this agenda, and I am very happy that I was able to shoehorn in here. I know it's very late, I don't want to keep you guys much longer than we have to. But it was really important that I got to speak in front of you all.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** So on a different note completely, you have an elevator internal to the building that goes up three floors.

**Mr. Cordone:** Yes.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Where do you propose to put the mechanism for that? Below the elevator, or above it? Because the roof seems to be very shallow-pitched. I couldn't see where you would fit it in the roof.

**Mr. Cordone:** That's a very good question. We are entertaining the idea of a machine-less room elevator and a limited hoist beam mechanism for our elevator. When I did my initial zoning, it looked to me that we had the ... with our sight lines, it looked to me that we could get a base height of 32 feet. I'm proposing that our building's going to be at 29 feet. So I have a little bit of wiggle room for that bulkhead if I need it.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I mean, how do we proceed with what you were suggesting, Richard, trying to deal in a different way with parking in this area? I mean, I know what you're saying and I think this is an interesting area to try to look at other options, but what would be the next step for Matthew's team or ...

**Boardmember Bass:** Well, that's a really good question. You know, we could be proactive and amend the zoning map so that (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Well, you can't (off-mic).

**Boardmember Bass:** We, the Village, can.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Yeah.

**Boardmember Bass:** So we correct ... we have the zoning match the real uses on West Main Street. And if we were to do that, we would then address parking as an issue. Or we do it the other way around. We let the architect come back to us with a more workable plan and we collectively come up with a way to get there. You know, there's different ways to skin this cat. But I think this is a much better design than the one I saw a year or two ago.

**Mr. Cordone:** Thank you.

**Boardmember Bass:** But still, the parking's wagging the dog. You know, the urban design, the things we've addressed, I think we're open to coming up with a creative solution. So let's do it together. We'll throw it back to you. Come back to us with a plan, and then we can decide how we want to address it from a public policy point of view. Whether we want to deal with it as a variance and support it that way, or we want to suggest amendments to the zoning to support it that way. Take your pick.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, I think in terms of a timeline ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Variance.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** ... the variance is probably going to be the first step. Then we address with the Village to redo the zoning.

**Mr. Cordone:** OK.

**Boardmember Bass:** So wow us with a great design.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** When you say "variance," you're meaning a different number of parking spaces.

**Boardmember Bass:** Well, it would be relief from the parking, it would be relief from the use. Because expansion of a nonconforming use, I think, is an issue.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's a little bit of a stretch, we call it. But we will.

**Mr. Cordone:** Right.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** That makes sense. I mean, it does make sense.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** That, we just need to figure out a way. OK, thank you. I just wanted some clarification where you're headed because I was leaning towards (off-mic).

**Boardmember Bass:** Well, I'm open. I bring my cane and dog to these meetings.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I mean, I say it makes sense because (cross-talk) ...

**Mr. Cordone:** That actually happened to me once. I was getting an ADA variance, and part of the quorum was a woman with a seeing eye dog and a cane.

But one of the things that maybe we can discuss is, if I am providing bicycle storage perhaps there's some sort of an offset we can do with off-street or off-site parking and potential bicycle parking for that. I mean, I don't know, it's something that would have to go through the Zoning Board. But maybe there are types of like offsets that we could do.

**Boardmember Bass:** I don't know how the Village deals with parking. In some other communities, in this type of situation, they take ... they do the economic calculation of what you're saving by not providing parking on-site, and you quote, unquote "rent," or "buy" public spaces in the larger lot that the village owns and that goes into a parking fine. I'm not sure. You know, I'm making this up as I go.

**Boardmember Gould-Schmit:** Dobbs does it.

**Mr. Cordone:** Oh, it does?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes, Dobbs Ferry does that.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** So we can ... it is an unusual place. It's off a parking lot, it's near a parking lot. I have to say Zinsser seems to be a madhouse with the desire and need for permanence. We aren't parking there anymore, but my impression is that there's a lot of demand ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** ... for commuter parking. There aren't enough spaces for the residents. So I think we need to test how available parking is in these adjacent public lots.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** But the problem with the Steinschneider parking area is that it's limited time. I think it's a two-hour time limit.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yep, right.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** (Off-mic).

(Cross-talk)

**Boardmember Cameron:** Richard, you pointed out that the residents of that part of – I think it's called "West Main Street" – they ... almost none of them have off-street parking, and yet they do have cars. I don't know how they go about parking their vehicles.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** I think one of them has off-street parking.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I see a little garage-like thing.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, I would bet that a number of the people living there actually have jobs that cause them to drive to work ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Right, they're not there during the day.

**Boardmember Cameron:** .. and they just park in the parking lot at night.

**Mr. Cordone:** I can offer a little insight on the existing structure and the four units there. There are currently existing parking lots, as you guys probably know, within the vacant area. These parking spots get rented out. The people who live there don't have cars, so it might be something to think about if you're in a downtown district.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, do they rent them out to other people on West Main Street?

**Mr. Cordone:** No.



**Boardmember Ambrozek:** So they rent it out to people who work in the area.

**Mr. Cordone:** That's correct, yes.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** No, they walk to the train.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** No, no, people working in Hastings are renting the parking spaces that are associated with the existing building.

**Mr. Cordone:** And most of time, if you walk by (cross-talk).

(Cross-talk)

**Boardmember Cameron:** (Cross-talk) numbers painted on the pavement.

**Mr. Cordone:** Poorly painted, but yes.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Some of the other residents on West Main are also renting spaces in the parking lot.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, that was my question.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Well, they're probably not there during the day. They use them at night and they rent them out during the day.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** No, this particular piece of property – 12 West Main – other residents on West Main are renting (cross-talk) ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Are renting spaces.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Because they have cars and don't have spaces to put them in.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** So this would displace them, this would displace their parking.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Or find some other way (cross-talk).

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** We're concerned about displacing the residents of the existing building, so ...

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** How many units are there in the existing building.

**Mr. Cordone:** Four.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Four 2-bedrooms.

**Mr. Cordone:** With 17 parking spots there, it could be a potential cash cow for the people who live here if they're renting them all out.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** A crazy number of parking spaces.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, I don't think ... do we require parking with affordable housing?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Honestly, I think a parking variance makes all the sense in the world.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** It's not two units.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** First of all, just to provide that kind of parking for these 10 units is crazy. I think you apply for a parking variance, you argue the fact that at night you have the lot; that this is really a ... some of these are one-bedrooms, right?

**Mr. Cordone:** One-bedrooms and two-bedrooms, primarily.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** There's all kinds of studies that show now that in a TOD type of situation the parking demand is much less, really point-something. And this is ... you're not going to get ... even in the two-bedrooms the likelihood is you may get people with only one car.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** I think that would be something you would need you to come to us with when you come back with this in the future; some analysis, some information that can back up a parking variance.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** A parking variance.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** The other question I was going to ask was, what is the percent lot coverage?

**Mr. Cordone:** Oh, that's a good question.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, you can also tell us who's parking in your parking lot right now and are they people who live on West Main or elsewhere.

**Mr. Cordone:** Yeah, but we have a combination. There are people who do live on West Main who park there, and there's also (cross-talk) ...

**Boardmember Cameron:** But we'd like to know how many because (cross-talk) ...

**Mr. Cordone:** And if you would go there anytime you'll see that most of those spots are actually vacant throughout the day.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** So in the CC district there is no coverage.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Right.

**Mr. Cordone:** Yeah.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Is there an existing garage on the lot that will be removed?

**Mr. Cordone:** There is an existing shed. It is not necessarily a parking garage. It is a garage on the most modest level of a single-family home that's filled with shovels and wheelbarrows.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** So it has no particular utilitarian purpose.

**Mr. Cordone:** That's correct, yes.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** We just lost Kerry, and I think that's a really good idea. I think we'd love to talk more about decreasing parking, if you could come up with some good examples, arguments, discussion points on that.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** And I'd like to know what the lot coverage is, percent lot coverage.

**Mr. Cordone:** Yeah.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** That also was a comment when Linda and I spoke about this, that typically we get the zoning information as well.

**Mr. Cordone:** OK.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Right, to see what else might be nice. Obviously, we know there's a use issue.

**Mr. Cordone:** Sure.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** But what else here doesn't conform, if anything.

**Mr. Cordone:** Yeah, OK.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** What are the potential variances we might need to give you.

**Mr. Cordone:** Right, sounds good. All right.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Is that good? You have your information?

**Mr. Cordone:** This is great. Thank you very much, guys, for sitting here. I appreciate the late hours that you're putting in, and hopefully I'll cobble something together and you can take another look at it.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Would you like Matthew to come back with another discussion later, or would you like to turn this into a submission?

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Well, you know, this was a discussion item, and I think based on (cross-talk) ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, why we don't ask the architect that question?

**Chairperson Sullivan:** No, no, this is kind of a site plan issue. Because I would like ... the next time you come back it should be as another discussion item rather than a site plan submittal. Just our previous discussion earlier tonight when we thought site plan, I had a second go-round.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** You get the same input.

**Mr. Cordone:** Well, if I can come back with maybe some more information on the variance

for the parking I can adjust ...

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** I have a list for you.

**Mr. Cordone:** Yeah, OK. That sounds great, I'll be more than happy to come back for another discussion.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Well, when you're ready.

**Mr. Cordone:** Thanks.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** Good, thank you very much.

OK, may I have someone on the Planning Board make the motion to adjourn the meeting?

On MOTION of Boardmember Cameron, SECONDED by Boardmember Ambrozek with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Sullivan adjourned the Regular Meeting.

**Chairperson Sullivan:** All right, thank you very much.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** We are adjourned.