

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK  
PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
JANUARY 18, 2024**

*Meetings held by the Planning Board are  
live-streamed via WHoH-TV (Channel 75) FIOS 43  
and online at WHoH-TV.org  
[ZoningBoard@hastingsgov.org](mailto:ZoningBoard@hastingsgov.org)*

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Eva Alligood, Boardmember William O'Reilly, Boardmember Richard Bass, Boardmember Charles Kim, Alternate Boardmember Richard Martin, Boardmember Spencer Orcus, Boardmember Ernesto Vigoreaux, Village Counsel Linda Whitehead, Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., Planning Consultant Patrick Cleary, and Planning Board Secretary Mary Ellen Ballantine

**Chairperson Alligood:** Welcome everyone to the planning board meeting of the Hastings planning board of January 18th, 2024. May I have the roll call, Mary Ellen?

**I. ROLL CALL**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting of December 21, 2023**

**Chairperson Alligood:** Any comments or changes from boardmembers on the minutes?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I have none.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Okay, I have none either. So may I have a motion to approve the minutes from December 21st?

On **MOTION** of Boardmember Bass, **SECONDED** by Boardmember Vigoreaux, with a voice vote of all in favor the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of January 21, 2023 were approved as presented.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Okay, unanimous vote "yes" on that.

### III. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Subdivision and Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Richard & Joe Abirizk for the creation of two conforming lots for two proposed single-family dwellings on their property located at the corner lot of Warren Street & Pearl Street pursuant to the provisions of Section 295-115 & 295-147 of the Village Code. Said property is in R-10 Zoning District and is also known as SBL: 4.110-121-1.1 on the Village Tax Maps.

**\*\* [ Deferred to Future Meeting ] \*\***

2. Preservation Advisory, Site Plan Approval & Steep Slopes Approval for demolition of an existing three-family building and construction of an eight-unit residential project with one commercial space on four (4) existing tax lots located at 425 Warburton Avenue & 0 Ridge Street. Said property is in MR-0/2R-3.5 Zoning Districts and is known as SBL 4.70-52-7,10,11 & 41 on the Village Tax Maps.

**\*\* [ Deferred to Future Meeting ] \*\***

### IV. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Lawrence & Deborah May for a new swimming pool and retaining walls on their property located at 60 Edgars Lane. Said property is located in the R-10 zoning district and is known as SBL; 4.40-27-22 on the Village Tax Maps.

**\*\* [ Deferred to February Meeting ] \*\***

**Chairperson Alligood:** Just so people know, when the agenda says "old public hearings" and it says "deferred" that means that while it's on the agenda we're not going to be talking about it tonight. So the first two items are deferred and we're moving on to new public hearings. There has been a change since when the agenda was first posted a few days ago. The applicant for the steep slopes approval – the application of Lawrence and Deborah May for a new swimming pool and retaining walls on their property located at 60 Edgar's Lane – that agenda item is being deferred at their request.

**2. Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Michael Meyers & Irene Steiner for the creation of new retaining walls and regrading to create floral gardens on their property located at 12 Summit Street.**

**Said property is located in the R-10 zoning district and is known as SBL; 4.140-144-6 on the Village Tax Maps.**

**Chairperson Alligood:** So we have two new public hearings we're going to cover tonight. For the first one, is anyone here for the steep slopes approval application?

**Attorney Whitehead:** The applicant doesn't seem to be here [laughter].

**Chairperson Alligood:** Okay, that's unusual.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Next.

**Chairperson Alligood:** How do we handle that one? We have a memo from Doug Hahn.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Just go to the next one.

**Chairperson Alligood:** So we are going to skip that for now.

**3. Site Plan Approval – Application of 445 Broadway Hastings Realty Corp for rebuilding of the front entrance steps and adding an ADA accessibility ramp to their multi-family residential property located at 445 N. Broadway. Said property is in the MR-1.5 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.80-60-2 on the Village Tax Maps.**

**Chairperson Alligood:** It looks like we have somebody here to speak about the project.

**Paul Fusco, Louis Fusco Landscape Architects:** We're here on behalf of the board and HOA committee at 445 Broadway for the proposed project. As mentioned there, they are proposing a new ADA ramp for accessibility to their front entryway. I'm not sure how many of you are familiar with the property or you've visited the site. I have some photos, and I'll zoom in here for you. This is their existing entry loop. They have a blue awning, if you've seen it from the street. This is their entry loop. Right alongside of it is a concrete walkway or path that connects to the Village street path. They have two steps up their front landing and then that goes right into their front door.

Our proposed plan keeps the generic ... well, keeps the shape of the existing entryway here

with the driveway; keeps the asphalt on the concrete walkway. What we are adding here is a new ramp that comes along it to the front entry landing so there's accessible access to the front entryway. Part of the application is replacing the set of stairs. It's an old concrete set of stairs that are rundown, with uneven step riser heights that wouldn't meet code today. So that is being replaced, as well. Along with that, the concrete walkway is in the same location but being replaced to be a new concrete walk along the driveway road there. That's the extent of what the project is taking place for here.

This is just a close-up of what the ramp is. There will be a picketed railing on both sides of the ramp. The elevation change between the walkway and the front stoop is actually about 14 inches so it's not a large ramp by any means – it's not a significant grade change elevation – but we do have to, per code, make it ADA-compliant. There's a landing at certain elevations and changes to get up to the top landing. I don't know if there's any questions from the board on the current project?

**Boardmember Orcus:** What happens at the end of the landing as you're coming down?

**Mr. Fusco:** At the end of the landing we have a new concrete flair as the traditional apron access. So it'll go flush to the asphalt road that loops around, that drop-off area they have. So that'll get flush to there, then it has the code-compliant flairs to get up to the walkway or go straight up to the ramp.

**Chairperson Alligood:** We do have a memo from our engineer, Doug Hahn. And I'm wondering if, Patrick, you have any comments on the memo.

**Village Planner Cleary:** On Doug's memo, no. Very straightforward, fairly minor comments on it. Mostly details to be added to the drawings.

**Mr. Fusco:** Yes. And actually the plan I'm presenting today I can go through them, but we did answer and make those revisions. Like I said, some clerical notes and a few details to be added.

**Village Planner Cleary:** So no major issues there, but I do have one question. You just mentioned you're rebuilding the front stair?

**Mr. Fusco:** The front stoop and landing, yes.

**Village Planner Cleary:** So the ramp will bring you up but it's still not accessible through the stair? How does ...

**Mr. Fusco:** The ramp will bring you up to the top landing which is flush with the inside doorway. So that'll be a flush-even transition. In the center, where there are existing three risers ...

**Village Planner Cleary:** There's separate stairs?

**Mr. Fusco:** ... that are separate stairs, that'll actually be moved into two risers.

**Village Planner Cleary:** Understood, thank you.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Okay, any other comments or questions you want to share?

**Village Planner Cleary:** It's encouraging to see ADA ramps being installed. It's a good thing.

**Boardmember Orcus:** This isn't part of our purview, but ...

**Attorney Whitehead:** But you'll ask anyway.

[Laughter]

**Boardmember Orcus:** No, I'm just throwin' it out there. You know, you guys are obviously doing this for all the right reasons. My vague, unprofessional recollection is that you need a landing every 12 feet, which would put it somewhere at that elbow?

**Mr. Fusco:** So yeah, it's based off of a combination of distance traveled and elevation raised. Because our pitches are minor – 'cause we're only climbing 14 inches – we're able to mitigate that.

**Boardmember Orcus:** One stretch?

**Mr. Fusco:** Exactly, one stretch.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** They're not reaching the code minimum of 1 in 12. What is your rise?

**Mr. Fusco:** We're doing actually a 6 percent right now instead of an 8 percent. We're down a little lower. And it may even be a little less depending on where we end up with this flare in the corner. But right now we know it's a maximum of 6 percent.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Do other boardmembers ... yes?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I was just going to say that allows for a motorized as well as a push-along wheelchair?

**Mr. Fusco:** Yeah, we have the width. The widths are compliant with all the ADA, and then that turnaround you can see it's kind of got that little jog-out which is required for motorized or, I would assume, every motor ... and to be honest, we're following ADA-compliant rules. So it would accommodate anything like that. There may be some, depending on models. I would assume they all meet ADA-compliant rules, so you should be fine.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Any other comments or questions from boardmembers? No? Okay. So it seems like, just to reiterate, Hahn's comments seem pretty easily addressed. And it sounds like you've already gone ahead and done that very quickly. So with that, if the board is prepared we can go ...

**Attorney Whitehead:** Public?

**Chairperson Alligood:** Oh, yes. Are there any members of the public who want to comment or have questions? Okay, no members of the public.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Have to ask.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Thank you for reminding me. So if the board is prepared we can go ahead with approval with the condition that comments in the Hahn Engineering memo be addressed. So with that, do I have a motion to approve the site plan application of 445 Broadway, Hastings Realty Corp., for rebuilding of the front steps and adding an ADA-accessibility ramp to a multi-family residential property located at 445 North Broadway subject to the applicant addressing the comments in the Hahn Engineering memo?

On **MOTION** of Boardmember O'Reilly, **SECONDED** by Boardmember Orkus, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved to approve the site plan application of 445 Broadway Hastings Realty Corp for rebuilding of the front entrance steps and adding an ADA accessibility ramp to the multi-family residential property located at 445 N. Broadway. Approval is subject to applicant addressing comments from Hahn Engineering.

**Chairperson Alligood:** So it passes unanimously.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** I just want to mention that this is subject to the ARB, which they're going to do next month. So of course they won't be moving on to a building permit until they achieve ARB approval.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Okay, good to know. Thank you, Charles, for that.

**Mr. Fusco:** Thank you. Have a good evening.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Thank you, good luck with it. It looks like we don't have the other applicant here yet. I haven't seen any change in members of the public here, or audience, so why don't we move on to the discussion item that's on for tonight.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** Madam Chair, also I did e-mail the first applicant today with Hahn's review and I never heard back from them. So I don't really know what's going on.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes. The other applicant that got the Hahn's memo said, We'll come back next time because we want to have time to review it. It's possible they were thinking the same and just didn't say anything to us.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Yes, but theirs were fairly minor comments. The one that pulled off.

**Chairperson Alligood:** So let's move on to our discussion item for tonight.

**V. DISCUSSION ITEM**

**Proposed Local Law A of 2024 - A local law amending the zoning map of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson to rezone the parcel known as 623 Warburton Avenue to the 2-R Zoning District.**

**Chairperson Alligood:** This local law has been referred to as required by the Village code prior to the board of trustees public hearing. And the applicant is here, so if you'd like to make a brief presentation you may do so. Just introduce yourself.

**Kory Salomone, Zarin & Steinmetz:** I'm here tonight on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Wilson in connection with the zoning petition. Mr. Wilson is here with me this evening, as is my colleague, Jaclyn Cohen. As you pointed out, procedurally the petition was before the board of trustees on January 2nd, referred to your board as well as to the ZBA, and a public hearing has been scheduled at the board of trustees for February 6th.

The property is 0.24 acres, currently located in the C-O zoning district. It had previously

been in the 2-R zoning district and in the '60s was rezoned to C-O. Mr. and Mrs. Wilson owned the adjacent property at 86 Maple Ave. They purchased this property and in 2019 demolished an existing approximately 7,000 square foot office building. You can see here your current zoning map. What's in yellow is the 2-R, so to the northwest and southwest is all residential so we are keeping, you know, in the character of the neighborhood. I mean, it's a pretty straightforward application, more than happy to answer any questions that you'd have.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Well, before we go to any comments or questions from the board, Pat, do you have any comments or want to add anything?

**Village Planner Cleary:** This is an interesting discussion. This is a site that's technically in one of our downtown districts, but it's the last lot – shown very clearly on that illustration. There's a couple of things to bear in mind. Always, those lots become transitional in nature. Is it better to preserve it as a commercial lot and potentially develop a commercial use that might be more appropriate in the core of the downtown instead of on the fringe of the downtown, and is it more appropriate to create residential use in our downtown area, which we lack. So there's a reason to do this.

Changing zoning's a significant decision, but once you get to these fringe areas it can go either way. You can make arguments either way, but I think the compelling issue these days is preserving the core of our downtown areas. If we're going to dilute that by allowing somebody to go from the downtown to an outlying parcel that's a problem. That's an important element. The other thing, as Kory mentioned to you, is this used to be a 2-R zone; it was a single-family residential zone. The nature of that area is really residential. As you come down that sort of gateway it's a residential gateway, not a commercial gateway. So I think there are compelling arguments to consider the rezoning, but again it's one of those gray areas because it's the fringe of the downtown.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** Just to add to that, not only – as our planner mentioned – is it that it used to be 2-R, there used to be a house there. It was removed and the zone was changed when this medical building was built many moons ago. So essentially they're going back [laughter], or trying to go back.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes, that was in the application. And it is surrounded by mostly residential. I have my thoughts on it.

**Mr. Salomone:** If I could just point out one other thing. This, the area you see here pointing to the building, that used to be there. It kind of sticks out like a sore thumb. I think a residential home would be much more appropriately sited on this property.



**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes, it was a very unattractive building.

[Laughter]

It was *great* when the owners took it down. It was just not the right thing for that gateway entrance to Warburton and our downtown.

**Mr. Salomone:** I have some images of the proposed home if you guys would like to see it.

**Chairperson Alligood:** I think that would be helpful. And I do want to open it up for others. I'll say I think the map you showed, if you just go back to what you just showed when our planner was speaking, I think it's helpful to see how it ...

**Mr. Salomone:** The zoning map.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes, to see that it really is – when you look at the surrounding area – the only thing that is zoned commercial office other than what's across from it, which is *not* connected as well to the residential buildings around it. That's my first take. But go ahead and show us pictures of what they want to build there.

**Village Planner Cleary:** Madam Chair, I raise one other point. The property is sloping, and the reason that building was sort of a sore thumb that stuck out is because it's literally stuck out of the site. If someone were to redevelop it for a commercial use they would likely have to maximize that potential again with another building. And with that slope it's probably going to be a taller building than would be a single-family home that would probably be built into that slope.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Can you remind us of how the parking was taken care of when that commercial building was there?

**Attorney Whitehead:** It showed in that picture, I think. You went down and underneath.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** It had two driveways, one on the south side, one on the north side. And it went down around to parking underneath the structure.

**Mr. Salomone:** Sorry, all these are different sizes. So what you have here is the proposed home to be built. Then in yellow was the outline of the existing structure that had been there that was demolished. So you see the size differential there? We'd lose one of the curbcuts, just one single curbcut around the house here.

**Boardmember Bass:** The size of the lot is?

**Mr. Salomone:** It's 0.24 acres, about a quarter-acre.

**Chairperson Alligood:** In that view do we see how it relates to the house that's facing Maple?

**Mr. Salomone:** Mr. Wilson's house? Not in that view.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** It used to belong to that house right?

**Attorney Whitehead:** It does.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Still does, the lot still does.

**Mr. Salomone:** So I believe this, the west elevation, would be the view of Mr. and Mrs. Wilson's house looking at the back of the new proposed home. Again, just keep in mind the topography here. That's why it looks like three stories here. There will be some variances required, again because of the topography and working with it.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** And to make it clear to the board, you are reusing the existing curbcut and existing driveway cut.

**Attorney Whitehead:** One of the curbcuts.

**Mr. Salomone:** Yes.

**Boardmember Bass:** And it's proposed as a single-family home?

**Mr. Salomone:** Correct.

**Boardmember Bass:** As opposed to a multi dwelling with ground floor retail?

**Mr. Salomone:** Correct.

**Attorney Whitehead:** The proposal is to rezone it to the two-family zoning.

**Boardmember Bass:** No, I understand. But again, based on the discussion we've already had it's an extension of the commercial area. It's across the street from a gas station and a

church.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Actually there's the intervening building.

**Boardmember Bass:** True.

**Boardmember Kim:** I live right around the block from it and there's the ... if it was the commercial building right on the corner I think it'd be much more problematic 'cause it's across from the gas station and whatnot. But it's the next lot over, across the street, there's a huge retaining wall for the commercial that's on top. So it doesn't necessarily face ground floor retail, per se. There's a distinction there, and it kind of connects to what they call, historically, the Tower Ridge neighborhood. So contextually I think the prior use is much more appropriate to the Tower Ridge existing homes there.

**Attorney Whitehead:** And that's what it was prior to the '60s.

**Mr. Salomone:** One thing I neglected to say is that we also spoke to a number of our neighbors. I submitted the letters of support. I don't know if you had a chance to read them, but there's a number of letters of support for this.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes, I did see them.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Then you also had that other building on the corner of North, which is also for sale. I was just wondering how we consider the two. Isn't that property for sale currently?

**Male Voice:** Yes.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** It is. So you've got two properties for sale, both of which are currently commercial. I'm sort of thinking about how it's going to happen if there's another commercial building on that corner, then a residential one next to it. I'm sort of thinking what a shame the two are not being thought of together, in a way, because I don't know what the intention is about that building on the corner. Because both buildings have sort of been a ...

**Mr. Salomone:** Well, that's a perfect comment to offer back to the board, the board of trustees. Why not consider it as a whole.

**Attorney Whitehead:** I do that. Though – and we've talked about this a little bit before – the building on the corner is different for some of the reasons you just said. It faces the gas

station, it is closer to part of the commercial core; faces the gas station, it's more across from the church. This is sort of separate from that. But who knows who's going to buy that and what they're going to want to do there; whether it's going to stay an office building, whether they're going to want to put something different there. Without knowing what someone wants to do there you could certainly make the comment back to the board. And the board actually discussed it a little bit, the board of trustees, at their first meeting in January when they scheduled a public hearing and referred this out. And talked about how the two properties, even though they're adjacent, are actually very different in their orientation.

**Chairperson Alligood:** If you could put that image back up of how the house is being planned, I think what's helpful to see – if I understand that correctly – is ...

**Mr. Salomone:** Which? This one here?

**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes, that one. I wanted to just point out that what this design is doing is reconnecting to the stairway and the street in a way that isn't there now. I know it's just being used as a lot, an extension of the other property the owner owns, but I think that's actually a positive in a way that that prior commercial building did not connect well with the street. Especially with people driving up and parking underneath it didn't invite much pedestrian experience. And that whole plaza area has been refurbished that's nearby, that little park. So I'll just say I think that this, design-wise and experience-wise for a downtown structure, does feel like it's in keeping with the look and feel and experience we want in the downtown. And also adding more residential is a good thing for keeping the vibrancy of the downtown, people going to the restaurants and the stores. We don't have all of our storefronts even occupied at this point, so like forcing the owner to do something with retail I'm not sure is even the wisest thing. That's just my ... usually I let everybody else talk first, but I did have ... I know this property, have seen it many times, and think this is ... especially I hadn't seen the design before, but I think ...

**Mr. Salomone:** The other thing I just want to point out, and it's shown on this image, is that there's an usually large right of way in front of this property. If this is now a residential property, that owner will have more of a sense of ownership – even though it's not their property – to maintain it and take care of it. So that's not a bad thing.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Just historically, because I know it looks now like a very odd lot with Wagner Plaza in front of it, I can tell you historically the conformation of Warburton went straight, right up against this property. So that extra right of way didn't used to be there, there used to be a triangle in the middle. Warburton came this way and Broadway came this way, and there was a triangle – having grown up the street [laughter]. So it's interesting because when you look at it you see sort of it's odd because this actually kind of fronts on

Wagner Park now, it doesn't really front directly on Warburton. And that's because Warburton was moved away from the property in the '70s, mid-'70s.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I was going to add ... oh, sorry.

**Mr. Salomone:** I was just going to mention this is residential on this side, as well.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Correct.

**Mr. Salomone:** Continuing along with Broadway, making that turn, you've got residential. If this was commercial ...

**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes, we'd be having a different conversation.

**Mr. Salomone:** But since it is residential coming in, and then at the first corner you have this commercial building and then you have the gas station and so on and so forth, it kind of seems appropriate.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** My reaction to that part has always been one of feeling it's odd. And the fact that it was residential, then went to commercial, now we want to go back to residential. And we have that building next door which is commercial that turns its side to you, to Warburton, facing north, the north street – which in a map I saw was once called Ridgedell – like a continuation of the other street. It just sort of, to me, reflects it's not officially fallow. We're not quite sure what to do with the whole corner. From a planning point of view it just leaves ... it's always been a bit of a muddle. And I kind of think are we going to put it back as part of a muddle or do we know what we're going to do with that corner in particular. Because it is like the gateway corner. Both buildings have been a little awkward, even though it gave you a place to park if you were running late for St. Matthews, running late for church. This was where you could park when you couldn't find anything else. Again, I went to the doctor in that building when it was there. Between the two of them I always thought how did they get here?

**Village Planner Cleary:** So Bill, just another point. You may want to encourage your colleague, Richard, to bring this back to the comprehensive plan discussion. It's a suitable conversation to have in the broader context of the master plan.

**Attorney Whitehead:** About the transition coming out of the downtown.

**Village Planner Cleary:** Right. And Richard's our liaison. That's why I said that.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Do other people want to comment or ask a question?

**Boardmember Orcus:** Sure. I would just say that yes, retail is struggling and there's a shortage of housing so it seems like particularly in this location a proper transition. Just quickly, is this going to be single-family or two-family?

**Mr. Salomone:** Single-family.

**Boardmember Vigoreaux:** I may be looking at it wrong, but is the building height equal to the corner building or is it higher, taller, than the corner commercial building?

**Mr. Salomone:** From Warburton it's 24 feet high, but I'm not sure how high the commercial building is.

**Attorney Whitehead:** It's down a little. The elevation's a little lower.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Anybody else?

**Boardmember Kim:** I probably have less history with Hastings generally than some other people here so I don't have a recollection of what was there or was not there. But I guess a pair of fresh eyes: it just does seem strange to me that there would be a commercial property where that is, which looks very residential. Like in my mind, when I'm going down Warburton, the gas station is kind of where the commercial area starts, or end. So to have something beyond that, if it were commercial it would have to be a very kind of, I don't know, vibrant commercial (chuckle) in order for it to sort of extend, you know, what we think of as the commercial corridor of downtown. And I would just say that I did read the letters that were very enthusiastically supportive of this. In my capacity, I think that speaks volumes about what the people who live in this area want to see and would like to see. So yes, I'm generally (background noise) about it.

**Chairperson Alligood:** That's helpful, Charles. And also knowing it's zoned for commercial office, if it stayed that way and was sold for development as a commercial office that, to me, is not the most vibrant commercial use. Office, that's what was there before. It doesn't really create, to my point earlier, vibrancy of the pedestrian experience having somebody drive up and go to their doctor's appointment. I don't feel like we're losing a lot by changing to that zoning. We can't guarantee that somebody would want to put a café there or something that does create more vibrancy.

**Mr. Salomone:** As you all well know, other than medical office, office space is not in high demand right now.

**Chairperson Alligood:** So then there's that, too. I don't know that we'd want to wait for a long process of having this, in my opinion. I think if somebody wants to build housing there, and we all agree it's appropriate, I wouldn't wait. It takes a long time to get these things through.

**Mr. Salomone:** And we obviously have no control over what the neighboring property owner may or may not want to do there.

**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes, we don't know and we can't force them to decide to do something different with the property once it's sold. So any other comments before I turn it over to Linda to tell us about next steps? Okay, great.

**Attorney Whitehead:** I think – as you're good at doing, you've done it a couple of times literally – we'll do a memo back to the board of trustees. I know Pat's been taking some notes. Remember last time, we went through sort of the various items in the code. So this one is only a math amendment. For a math amendment there's just three things. It's supposed to look at: *"whether, and how, the proposed amendment is consistent or inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the Village as it currently exists."* And you can help me with this, but I don't think this area is specifically discussed. But it does talk about strengthening the downtown. This is, I think, what everybody has said. This isn't really the downtown, this isn't really part of the commercial core. So you want to encourage your commercial in your commercial core, not someplace else. I don't know, Richard. You were on the comp plan committee for the existing comp plan.

**Boardmember Bass:** Well, there's discussion about the entrances into the downtown should have an established gateway, and our downtown doesn't. You know, Five Corners isn't a gateway. Warburton and Broadway is not a gateway. This particular lot, I'm not sure if it was developed as this or something else it would reinforce that gateway concept. The question I was asking is, with this large of a lot would it more appropriate for a multiple dwelling with a ground floor retail that would service that residential? But obviously not. That was another comp plan concept: to create more density in the downtown, and to do it either at the supermarket site at one end of the downtown and this site as another end. But our charge is not to speculate as developers but to look at land uses, and what's proposed makes as much sense as anything.

**Attorney Whitehead:** And the change you're making is really just from commercial to residential because whether it's two-family, whether it's a multi-family zone they could still choose to build a single-family. And you can't tell them they can't (chuckle).

Okay, so next was: *"whether the uses permitted by the proposed amendment or other change would be appropriate in the area concerned."* I think that's what most of our discussion has been: that this is an appropriate use in this location. Certainly all the letters from the neighbors also support that. Then the last was: *"whether adequate public schools or other facilities and services exist or can be created to serve the needs of any additional development likely to be constructed as a result of the amendment or change."* This is one single-family home. The amendment would only allow one two-family home so it's not creating any kind of significant additional burden. With that, you just indicate ... it sounds like this board's recommendation is that the board of trustees proceed with the requested rezoning. Yes?

**Chairperson Alligood:** Yes.

[Laughter]

Everyone here has said yes.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Okay, we will pass that on to the board of trustees.

**Mr. Salomone:** Thank you very much for your time. Really appreciate it.

**Attorney Whitehead:** And you handled the tech okay [laughter].

**Mr. Salomone:** I brought backup just in case.

**Chairperson Alligood:** So we don't have any other matters before us, right? We didn't have the other applicants.

**Attorney Whitehead:** And the other applicant did not appear.

**Chairperson Alligood:** They'll come back.

## **VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Next Meeting Date – February 15, 2024**

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

On **MOTION** of Boardmember Bass, **SECONDED** by Boardmember Kim, with a voice vote of all in favor Chairperson Alligood adjourned the Regular Meeting.



**PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
JANUARY 18, 2024  
Page - 17 -**