

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK  
PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
MARCH 17, 2016**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, March 17, 2016 at 8:15 p.m. in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

**PRESENT:** Chairman James Cameron, Boardmember Eva Alligood, Boardmember Michael Ambrozek, Boardmember William O'Reilly, Boardmember Kathleen Sullivan, Boardmember Richard Bass, Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., and Deputy Village Clerk Mary Ellen Ballantine

**Chairman Cameron:** Welcome to the meeting of a Planning Board of Thursday, March 17, 2016. Could we have a roll call, please, Mary Ellen?

**I. ROLL CALL**

**II. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON**

**Chairman Cameron:** As many of you may know, we did not actually meet in either January or February for lack of business. We're happy to see customers back again.

What we do at the first meeting each year is elect a new Chair of the Planning Board. I'm not running for that position so I'm seeking people who would like to be Chair of the Planning Board for the rest of the year. I'm sorry, only nine months left so I encourage people to start volunteering names.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Has anybody volunteered?

**Chairman Cameron:** I didn't talk to people about it. I'm going to stay on the Planning Board and I'm going to work hard for the Planning Board, but I have too many things going on so I really can't do it anymore.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Well, I'll nominate Kathleen Sullivan.

**Boardmember Bass:** I'll second it.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I'll nominate Richard Bass.

**Boardmember Bass:** I respectfully decline.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I would be honored to do it. I will need help from the Board, other members, as we go forward just because of other commitments that I have. But I'd be honored to help serve the Village this way.

**Boardmember Bass:** We'll help you.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Thank you.

**Chairman Cameron:** So could I have a motion to that effect? All those in favor say "aye."

On MOTION of Boardmember O'Reilly, SECONDED by Boardmember Bass with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved the approval of Boardmember Kathleen Sullivan as Chairperson.

**Chairman Cameron:** Kathy, I thought I was going to have to move either way down there or way down there. I'm thrilled I only have to move one seat.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Well, could I ask a favor? Would you mind chairing this meeting 'til ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** She wasn't ready that fast.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, Kathy, I brought a complete set of the resolutions.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I will do as you wish.

**Chairman Cameron:** Where did I put my bag? I guess I lost my bag here somewhere.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Here it is.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I'll take notes.

**Chairman Cameron:** Here are all the resolutions, Kathy.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** OK, thank you. And I guess I'm ready. Just tell me what I need

to do.

**Chairman Cameron:** Actually, the next thing we do is approval of the minutes.

### **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

#### **Regular Meeting of December 17, 2015**

**Chairman Cameron:** Anybody have any comments on the minutes of the Planning Board?

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

**Chairman Cameron:** I did spot one on page ... "*the American 'Fanning' Association*" or something? I think it's the planning association. You're speaking, actually. It's page five of the minutes. I think it probably is the American Planning Association, if there is one.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** There is.

**Chairman Cameron:** And I already found we had a couple headings off, which I've already brought to Mary Ellen's attention.

Anybody else have any other comments?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I have no comments. I wasn't there.

**Chairman Cameron:** You're supposed to ask. All right, I'll do it. Does anybody wish to make a motion to approve the minutes?

On MOTION of Boardmember Bass, SECONDED by Boardmember O'Reilly with a voice vote of 5 in favor (Boardmember Ambrozek abstained), the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of December 17, 2015, were approved as amended.

### **IV. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 1. Accessory Apartment Permit Renewal – Application of Nicholas & Deborah Frascione – 331 Warburton Avenue – SBL: 4.100-93-4.2 on the Village Tax Maps. Waiver for square footage required.**

**Chairman Cameron:** We have an application of Nicholas and Deborah Frascone for approval of the accessory apartment at 331 Warburton Avenue. The reason we say these long addresses is that we can then actually search the minutes and find them later if we're looking for something. We always put down the property address of any property that's being considered.

Could I have a report from you, Buddy?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Yes, sir. This is one of our affordable housing units on Warburton Avenue. There have not been any changes to this accessory apartment. The apartment exceeds the permitted 25 percent coverage limit that was approved under the affordable housing regulations. No complaints have been received by this office in the last three years regarding this apartment. There is an 8.3 percent coverage overage from the maximum 25 percent. It's 33.33 percent of the primary building, it has off-street parking, and it is code-compliant.

**Chairman Cameron:** Any comments from anybody on the Planning Board? Any comments from anybody in the audience on this accessory apartment? I look forward to a resolution.

On MOTION of Boardmember Ambrozek, SECONDED by Boardmember Bass with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application of Nicholas and Deborah Frascone for the accessory apartment permit renewal at 331 Warburton Avenue, with a waiver for square footage required. Said property is also known as SBL: 4.100-93-4.2 on the Village tax maps.

2. **View Preservation Approval – Application of Soon Ja Kim for the addition of a three-season viewing room on her single-family dwelling at 189 Warburton Avenue. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.130-138-11 on the Village tax maps**

**Chairman Cameron:** The next item we have is the application of Soon Ja Kim for view preservation advisory per section 295-82 of the Village code for addition of a three-season viewing room on her single-family dwelling at 189 Warburton Avenue. If someone like to make a presentation for this property that'd be great. It's a wonderful view, by the way.

**Soon Ja Kim, applicant:** I have a hearing problem.

**Chairman Cameron:** Why don't you put the charts up wherever you're going to put them first.

**Ms. Kim:** [Off-mic]. I'm the homeowner of the house that's located at 189 Warburton Avenue. That is this house. Someone owns this house. This looks like one story, right?, but that's why my contractor said inside the structure it becomes a two-story. Here, I want to make the back toward the riverside for some more viewing room. This is only 14 by 14 and it is not even square but is a hexagon. The projection will be much smaller than a square.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Please just always talk into the mic. When you move it away they can't hear you, OK?

**Ms. Kim:** OK, OK. That 44 hexagonal room, small, the sole purpose is to view the beautiful river. Currently I can see the river view, but the south side of the park where the tree grows, my neighbors have planted trees, particularly evergreen trees like a fence, I have no control over. The park is full of big trees with big leaves, with the [poplar] XXX flower. I don't know the name of that. So it's densely growing. I ended up looking at the Palisades cliff and decided to add a small three-season viewing room, just small, within the setback zone. It is situated in the middle of the house structure. Or not exactly middle, but almost middle of the structure.

The end product will be here, that one. That one will be toward the river, and this is going to be the end product. I am going to emphasize there that that current house you don't see anything except the roof and the house. But behind the current structure is a dormer. That dormer is one dormer, but it has two bedrooms – master and then guest bedroom – and in between a very teeny small bathroom. You cannot see this from the front.

**Chairman Cameron:** Right.

**Ms. Kim:** You cannot see from the front. Only you can see the side you can see, right? But this addition will be even smaller. Then that dormer receded from that dormer's projection. So it's practically invisible, and the plus the roof. As you can see, there is nothing you can see the dormer's roof, right?, down below. So it's going to be an extension over that dormer roof. It will not be seen by anyone just like the way it is. After completed it, even on the back like this, but still this will be like this. Of course, you can see in the back. So this is the ... that's in case I [unintelligible] this so that if you want to examine I can pass by on paper.

See, this is all different angles actually by architect ... actually drew it the way it was

assumed things. See, you can see these things. OK, roof is no higher than anything. Then it's receded from the dormer so in any angle it is not going to be seen. But it'll be very beautiful. I'm really excited about it. Then I am getting old, and then have [unintelligible]. And then even I didn't make any vacation to anywhere. It's not too crazy in driving either. So when I get really old I thought, oh, my goodness, then I can make a trip upstairs to my viewing room. So I decided to muster everything. And it's just small enough to contain. You don't bother.

**Chairman Cameron:** I'm just worried you're not going to come downstairs. You'll probably never go downstairs. You'll be looking at the window all day. Well, that's gorgeous.

**Ms. Kim:** To pursue happiness is just a right. But it has contingent upon other's happiness, too, right? So I did regard that ... counted that into my consideration. So I ask ... as soon as I begin to think about this I asked my immediate neighbors what do you think. So, oh, go ahead. You know, they were all excited about it. So in my mind this will enhance the beauty of the house from the river side or anywhere else. You also have to consider real estate values, too.

**Chairman Cameron:** Sure.

**Ms. Kim:** I'm one of the community members. I don't want to become any deteriorating factor. So that's what I come up with this, and then I'm asking for your generous approval.

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, well, let me see if anybody on the Planning Board has a comment and we can go from there. Actually, then I'll ask if anyone in the audience has a comment.

**Ms. Kim:** I don't think my neighbors are here.

**Chairman Cameron:** Does anybody on the Planning Board have a comment on this addition?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** In addition to the viewing room, there was a very narrow deck which implies there was a door out from the viewing room. But my concern – and I'm not sure if this is our purview – it's such a small, narrow deck.

**Chairman Cameron:** I thought it was a diving board myself. I'm just kidding. That's the Building Department.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** That's the Building Department? OK. But it's two stories up and ...

**Chairman Cameron:** We're doing view preservation.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** ... somebody in the future – if one looks at a future use of that deck ...

**Ms. Kim:** OK, that idea came about because I lived long enough to consider all kind of other people, too, particularly workers and the construction workers too. So what we decided to do was, how about maintaining. Say that in the future you have to change the windows, for example, or do painting or something. Then you have to provide workers to have a safe way of maintaining, doing their work. See, roof is going to be a triangle, right? So therefore there will be a small 3-foot wide so walkway so people can wash windows or change windows or replace or whatever.

**Chairman Cameron:** Around the whole thing.

**Ms. Kim:** Yeah, that way. Also, the overhang will be another side so it accommodates ... I mean, it helps the workers. Plus, in considering there, the deck will be an extension of this they can hook up to. So that's why I said, oh, this will be wonderful if it's an open space.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I suggest [cross-talk] view preservation.

**Ms. Kim:** Yeah, that's OK. So it's within that zoning.

**Boardmember Alligood:** We thank you for explaining it. Actually, the reason we're here to review your project ...

**Boardmember Bass:** Actually it is.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yes. Go ahead, Richard.

**Ms. Kim:** [Unintelligible] it's all within setback, OK?

**Boardmember Bass:** I'm guessing there is not an impact from the extension of this proposed structure.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, I walked on the road and up the road both directions and I couldn't get an angle where I could see anything.

**Boardmember Bass:** OK. But, I know the building ... so I'm torn between two things. One, the submission is deficient in terms of giving us the application we could decide. But based on what we know about the site, I don't have a problem. I'm thinking about in the future this is not the type of applications we should have for view preservation.

**Boardmember Alligood:** It's not showing the impact.

**Boardmember Bass:** It's not showing me anything.

**Chairman Cameron:** It's not showing you a picture taken 100 yards down the road or 100 yards up the road.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Right, because that's all we're concerned about.

**Chairman Cameron:** If you go 60, 70 yards down the road you actually still can't see it, even it was there. Meanwhile, all you've got is a view of the cliffs and the river in front of you the entire time. If it were to make any impact whatsoever ... you've been staring at the river for the hundred yards as you went north.

**Boardmember Bass:** I Googled it and couldn't see an impact. So from a practical point of view I'm not troubled by the application. But I am troubled by the application.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** On one of the pages there's pictures from all angles. I can't see what else I could possibly ask the applicant for the Board.

**Boardmember Bass:** I didn't print what you sent. I'm only looking at this.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Oh, you want Ms. Kim to present that.

**Ms. Kim:** Just actual pictures.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Can we just explain to the public, we get electronic copies of some of these applications. So it's a lot to try to figure out on a screen. When we don't get printed copies we do rely on the presentation.

**Boardmember Bass:** And the public presentation ...

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** That's something we can do. We can definitely work with that.

**Boardmember Bass:** And the public presentation is the public presentation. What we know and what the public are two different things, based on this presentation.

**Ms. Kim:** These are the actual pictures for your reference. The final one is the presumed piece.

**Tapani Talo, architect:** May I?

**Chairman Cameron:** Both mics work.

**Mr. Talo:** Since I gave electronic views from the sides and come up and down the road, I did not expect to have to present it here. Also, Soon Ja did not know that. That's why there's a little disconnect.

**Chairman Cameron:** Any comments from the audience? Would you like to vote on this matter?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I'd be happy to.

**Chairman Cameron:** I have a resolution, I'd love to have someone propose it.

On MOTION of Boardmember O'Reilly, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board recommends, based on the application and other papers submitted, that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application of Soon Ja Kim for view preservation, as per sections 295-82 of the Village code, for the addition of a three-season viewing room on her single-family dwelling at 189 Warburton. Said property's located in the R-10 zoning district and is also known as SBL: 4.100-93-4.2 on the Village tax maps..

**Chairman Cameron:** Thank you very much.

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

**Chairman Cameron:** It's looks beautiful. I hope you enjoy it.

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

**3. View Preservation Approval - Application of Jessica Silvester & Daniel McNamara for the redesign and reconstruction of the existing roof on their single-family dwelling at 17 Pinecrest Drive. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.100-96-14&15 on the Village Tax Maps.**

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, application of Jessica Silvester and Daniel – good name for the day – McNamara for view preservation as per sections 295-82 of the Village code for the redesign and reconstruction of the existing roof on their single-family dwelling at 17 Pinecrest Drive.

**Mr. Stojanovic, Architect:** I'm here to represent Jessica and Dan McNamara with the application. The house in question is the Clark house, which some of you might know, on Pinecrest Drive. It is located between the drive as you go up from Warburton and the Aqueduct. The view is really from both sides coming up the street from Pinecrest, which would be this stake here.

You have, existing, a view of the addition that was done somewhere in the '60s by the Clarks themselves. It's a very broken volume, with different rooflines that are off the period, I guess, that creates some interesting lighting inside the volume but creates a lot of problems for the circulation within the volume. And, at the same time, also a lot of problems through the years in terms of waterproofing of the roof because there's six different slopes within a very small kind of volume.

On top of that, there is an added greenhouse that protrudes even further than the lines of the house down onto Pinecrest itself. It was done, again, in the same period so it's very funky, not insulated and so forth, and other problems water-wise. From the Aqueduct side there is a big opening where you actually see the fall of the stones that we had two years ago, I believe it was, that you can see clearly because of the openness that it creates. At the same time, you do see the volume of the library, which is this small addition, that has the roofline? The two things we're trying to achieve ... additionally, we are also trying to raise a bit the actual roof of the house, of the original house, still within the required height that we have but to create a better bedroom upstairs that's existing now. It's just to enlarge it.

You would lose some of the sky view, approximately 2 feet from what's now, walking down by division of the main roof. At the same time, what we are trying to do with the volume of the library, of this addition, is really to create a better, cleaner roofline that helps with the waterproofing, in general, of the house with the volume within and gives a better access, which now is just a point. One can access the room from the main floor only going down in

one spot, and otherwise the roof really comes down at you. There's a spiral case bringing it down. So we're trying to even out the roof at one line, creating a simpler kind of connection so it's a more balanced space within.

In the plan here of the survey you can see this orange square, which is the greenhouse. We would remove that completely and get rid of it, and work only within the footprint of the existing addition which is [unintelligible].

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** There's actually going to be a reduction in the front yard setback, even though it's still nonconforming. The greenhouse that's being taken down is ... when it comes off, the front yard setback will actually increase.

**Mr. Stojanovic:** The idea would be, by removing the greenhouse we would have also a straight line of the original house with the addition, instead of having this other volume that protrudes out and really has not much use at the moment, given the fact there is plenty of waterproofing problems and there's no heating there and so forth. There's no use to it.

I have some elevations also enlarged. This would be the existing view of the volume of the house now, which is this different kind of roof heights that I mentioned before, skylights on one that is very steep coming down, and then flatter. This is a taller volume with a very tall window high up. The idea would be, here you see in the pink still the old. The proposed one would be like a very simple straight façade that mimics and takes on the stone base of the house, which is surrounding throughout the ground floor – mimic that on the north side as well, simplifying – keeping the door of the opening that we still have for access to the garden. That would remain, but it's still all on the same foundation.

This is the greenhouse I mentioned that would be completely gone at that point. Then the western view from Pinecrest. Again, this is the existing house so you see the old house very balanced in period. Then the addition to kind of calm these rooflines that are really difficult to work with at the moment, and this greenhouse in front of it. The idea would be to really open up ... keep the view and the light because that's the western view that we have. But it would be in line with the western façade and open up completely only to the west, keeping the northern façade closed as it is now. At the same time, here you see the other lines of the existing roof of the main house that we are wanting to raise 2 feet to the new height, still being within the conformed (ph) height for that area.

Finally, a little bit more about the rooflines. This is upside down, but it doesn't matter. This is, again, viewing the rooflines, and this is the new rooflines. The colored area is really the 30-foot setback that would be required. So we're still within the nonconforming area, but reducing it by approximately 8 feet from what's now – trying to keep in line with what the

house is existing.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Will there be any access onto that new roof area from the house?

**Mr. Stojanovic:** No, it would be ... actually now, the strange thing is you have – not that anyone uses it other than repairs, I guess – from the porch, access to the roof because it cuts diagonally the porch one-sided. It's maybe like 3-1/2 feet so one can jump, and I did just to see things. At some point it was helpful to have it there, with a chair. But no, this would be a plain roof, really no access. The fact is, the only place that now one can access the volume from the house itself is one spot right here where it's a small little interior balcony with a spiral going down. Other than that, this roof is so steep you would really bang your head otherwise in getting down.

This would be a much easier access, really leveling so we have one continuous beam north-to-south and have, really, the 7-foot height minimum you would require to be able to go down in a clear manner, and more balanced. Again, one of the issues here has been constant repair. I was friends with Susan Holden, who used to own the house previous to the McNamaras buying it last year. And you know, water issues have always been a problem beyond what you just mentioned before. The house doesn't only create problems within, but drainage of the roof is also going down to Pinecrest in some mysterious ways we need to address technically, after the fact.

In terms of the view preservation, again you do lose some of the view through the heightening of this roofline we are suggesting from the Aqueduct when you walk. I don't believe you lose any of the view for the houses from Pinecrest Parkway, which are way higher up so they wouldn't really lose anything. Some of the sky exposure is lost. But this is also the most open space the town has on the Aqueduct because Susan Holden actually helped clear all the trees with the town. They worked on really maintaining the more beautiful older ones, and whatever shrub that grew was cleared at some point. This is why this view is as open as it is in the first place.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** If I could ask a question, I noticed on the pictures that accompanied the application some of the lines that were drawn to show what the anticipated height. And the difference did not look as high as the drawings indicated. I'm wondering what is the difference in the overall height.

**Mr. Stojanovic:** This is the ... you mean now for the additional?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Yes.

**Mr. Stojanovic:** Or for the main ...

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Well, actually for the addition and the main house. Because you're talking about a higher roofline overall?

**Mr. Stojanovic:** One thing, I think it's really hard because of the angle of the camera to really then transport that in Photoshop to draw that line. So we assessed as well as we could. But in terms of the section of the house and the elevation here, the existing roofline is at 28.2 feet, almost 28.3, and the proposed is 29.10. So it's really 18 inches we're going up. It's less than 2 feet of height on the main house. In addition, they're picking up the highest point existing now and coming over, basically, underneath the balcony.

This roofline partially is existing and the pink line is the roof existing. If I were to fill out that portion, here is really what we are filling out with a new roof in that sense. We're not building the entire heights. Only half is getting filled up because we already have the angle that you see mainly, really, from the Aqueduct only. Because from Warburton or from coming up Pinecrest you barely see that because it's so steep uphill. You really see the façade to the north of the house mainly when you approach, and nothing else.

**Chairman Cameron:** Any other questions from anybody on the Board? I'm going to miss that loop in the roof. I see it all the time. Anybody in the audience have any questions, any comments?

Are we ready to vote? I'm going to make the motion and see if anyone else wants it.

On MOTION of Boardmember Bass, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board recommends, based on the application and other papers submitted, that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application of Jessica Silvester and Daniel McNamara for view preservation as per Sections 295-82 of the Village code for the redesign and reconstruction of their single-family dwelling at 17 Pinecrest. Said property is located in the R-10 zoning district and is known as SBL: 4.100-96-14 &15 on the Village tax maps.

**Chairman Cameron:** Thank you very much.

**Mr. Stojanovic:** Thank you very much.

**4. Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Marc Leaf & Debra Oaks for the creation of a front, side and rear addition to their single-family dwelling at 30 Floral Drive. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.40-34-4 on the Village Tax Maps.**

[Boardmember Alligood recused]

**Chairman Cameron:** Application of Marc Leaf and Debra Oaks for the steep slopes approval. As a point of interest, Marc Leaf's mother was the chairman of the Planning Board back about 1980 when I first served on the Planning Board. But I got off for awhile.

**Doug Alligood, project architect:** This is a steep slopes application for an addition to an existing house on 30 Floral Drive. This is a site plan of the existing house, and this is a rendering here of the steep slopes line cutting through the existing house. The slope on this property is actually a 15- to 25 percent steep slope that starts at this line, according to the Westchester maps. This area is less than a 15 percent slope, and then continues in that direction as the steeper slope. What we are looking at here is just to show that a portion of the existing house is already constructed on the 15- to 25 percent steep slope. Again, that's what this axon is showing here in that drawing; that's the rear of the house.

What we are proposing is an addition at the rear of the house, removing the existing deck that's on that steep slope, and replacing that with a two-story addition in the same location, pulled back from the rear property line a little bit and extending to the east a couple of feet, maybe about 7 or 8 feet towards the east. We're also proposing a new deck on the southwestern side of the house above the existing driveway. About 40 percent of that deck will also be above the steep slopes. This area will actually be about 10- to 15 feet above grade at this point, so it's actually not engaging the ground, just the posts that come down from that deck. What this application is also proposing – it's not on the steep slopes – is an additional front covered porch. But that's not part of the steep slopes application.

Before I move on, I'll just show the axon that shows a couple different views of the steep slope cutting through the proposed house. What we are proposing here is actually a fairly small new addition. But the calculations that you see on the chart are accounting for the entire demonstrate, pre- and post development, and the portions that are on the steep slopes.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Ask them to stop talking in the hallway. Just ask them to move downstairs or something.

**Mr. Alligood:** So the maximum, of course, is 35 percent. That's the maximum development

that's allowed for the area of the steep slope, which yields approximately 2,500 square feet. And our post development, including existing conditions and proposed conditions, is approximately 1,250 so we're well below the maximum amount – 1,000 square feet less than the maximum – post development. That's including this portion of the existing driveway that starts on the top of the hill and rolls down the hill, the proposed deck, removal of the existing deck, the existing portion of the house that's on the steep slope, and the proposed addition on the steep slope.

In addition to that, the geotechnical civil engineer proposed connecting all the existing and new roof drains and footing drains to drywells located on a flat portion of the site at the rear of the house. Even though it's in a steep slope, it's actually fairly flat. Let's see if I can find that picture. This area here, you can see 434 and 436 elevations. That is approximately this area looking southwest on photographs of the existing conditions. You can see that's a fairly flat area. It will be located – the CULTECs, the drywells will be located – at least 10 feet away from the property line and more than 10 feet away from the house or any other new or existing structures.

That's basically the presentation for the steep slopes. I'm not sure if you'd like to hear more about the house or why we're proposing to build the addition. It's for a kitchen – enlarged kitchen – and a family room. We liked the idea of putting the addition in that location – let's see if I can find another photograph – so the ... I will put this up here and actually just describe this from the photograph rather than from the plan. What we're looking at is that the house is actually situated about the middle of the slope; it's more gentle at the top. If we were to try to put the addition anywhere else on the property it would actually be on rock, located above the existing ground floor. And it would also make the house much wider than any of the houses in the area.

Even though the lot is fairly wide, we felt putting it in this location discretely in the back was more in keeping with the neighborhood as well as an improvement to the house, the flow of the house, and the overall appearance of the house.

**Chairman Cameron:** Any questions?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I did walk around your property today. I did tap on the door to speak to somebody, I think it was your daughter. At the rear, there's almost three levels. I think you referred to one of those levels that's fairly broad.

**Mr. Alligood:** Yes.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Do you envision any disturbance of those tiers with the

construction?

**Mr. Alligood:** No. Actually, the – let's see if I have a picture of it ... this line right here ... actually, I shouldn't say no. So minimally ... so this line right here, that's the existing porch at the rear yard. We're proposing to be – I don't remember the exact number – probably about 3 or 4 feet away from that, in this direction. In a drawing you wouldn't be disturbing it. In reality, in order to put the footings in this first setback will probably be disturbed during construction. And I would propose to put it back exactly as it was – the other tiers going away from the house.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Yeah, right. Thank you.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Could you put up the diagram that shows the ... you briefly showed that.

**Mr. Alligood:** The proposed, or existing?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, it's both I think; one of each.

**Mr. Alligood:** OK. This is the proposed condition, and let me find the existing. This is the existing. This diagram is showing – in a bird's eye view, of course – that this is the deck at the rear of the house, this is the line of the steep slopes. This diagram is showing the zoning setbacks, front and rear yard. On this one, with the proposed house it's just two different overhead views on the steep slopes.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Thank you.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I went out – and did knock on the door, so I apologize – and walked around a couple days ago. I was surprised because it didn't really feel like a very steep slope when I was there. I think Westchester County offers a lot of amazing information, and you get topos and all sorts of things. But when you get a chance to look ... I took some time to look at the actual survey and found myself finding areas that weren't necessarily steep slopes in the area you called out as steep slopes, and found some steep slopes in areas where they weren't called out. I think this application is almost ... ventures the ability to ask for a hardship waive, in a sense, because it's doing such little disturbance of anything and basically using the same footprint with a few pop-outs .

I think just down the road, using the county's information – which is a real high-level kind of thing when we actually have a survey we can look at areas and kind of see where the actual slopes are – looking where 15- and 20 percent slopes are. I just make that as a comment

because I don't find this personally to be any huge impact, having any problems, or disturbing slopes in a way the owner needs to make some mitigation of it of some type. For what it's worth, it's very minimal in its disturbance.

The only other comment I'd like to make, I saw Mr. Narducci was the civil engineer on this. We had used him, Buddy on ... he was used by the owner of the mews project. I know there was an issue of Westchester County standards versus New York State standards. That's more for you to be comfortable with than for us, but I just noticed that, again, he was using the Westchester County standards. I don't know what the distinction is, if it's an impact at all.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** I'd have to look into it a little bit closer when it comes time, but I briefly went over the calculations and didn't see any issues with them.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Yeah, I don't know why he refers to the county when the state's what we use, but nonetheless.

**Chairman Cameron:** Any comments from the audience? I thought this was terrific. You actually managed to tuck in the spaces next to the existing building and produce a whole bunch of very rationally-shaped [groves] XXX inside. Congratulations. We're not supposed to look inside, though.

If we have no more comments I would propose a resolution.

On MOTION of Boardmember Sullivan, SECONDED by Boardmember O'Reilly with a voice vote of 5 in favor (Boardmember Alligood recused herself), the Board, based on the papers submitted at the meeting, hereby approve the steep slopes application of Marc Leaf and Debra Oaks in accordance with Chapter 249 of the Village code for the creation of a front, side and rear addition to their single-family dwelling at 30 Floral Drive. Said property is located at the R-10 zoning district and is known as SBL: 4.40-34-4 on the Village tax maps.

**Chairman Cameron:** You made it. Congratulations.

**Mr. Alligood:** Thank you.

**Chairman Cameron:** Thank you.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Eva back?

5. **Amendments to the Previously-Approved Site Plan - Application of Ginsburg Development Companies, LLC for the development of a 7.45-acre tract of land situated on the westerly side of Saw Mill River Road (State Route 9-A), immediately south of the municipal boundary with the unincorporated area of the Town of Greenburgh and approximately 0.3 mile south of the intersection of Lawrence Street and Saw Mill River Road, into a public space and a multi-family dwelling complex with a total of 66 dwelling units, 12 of which are proposed to be affordable units. The Amendments proposed make modifications to certain site improvements. Subject tract of land is situated in the Village's Mixed Use Planned Development District (MUPDD) as designated on the zoning map of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson. The property is designated as Lots 4.60-46-3.1, 3.2, 3.3 & 3.4 on the Village Assessment Roll.**

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, the only one left. If you would introduce yourself and charge ahead.

**Joe Gigaleski, Ginsburg Development Companies:** Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, and counsel. I've brought our chief architect for Ginsburg Development, Leo Torres, here with me as well tonight. We're here to discuss modifications to the Saw Mill Lofts project. Everything is moving fantastic in the field. As you see, the buildings are going up and everything's well underway.

As we began construction – and Martin further reviewed his plans and whatnot – there were a couple of modifications he thought were prudent to the site plan. That's what I'm here to present tonight. I first wanted to say that the mailing protocol for this amendment was completed and that I did not receive any further green cards than I've already submitted.

Just to give you guys an idea of where we are – and I do have a full application set that was submitted in the application – this is the overall site plan in this color version for you here to see tonight. There's four main modifications that we're going to discuss in a little more detail. I just wanted to run through each change modification.

Now, you can't see too much here from the color photo. But these entry areas here on both the north and the south entry points to the project, there's a paver treatment that's been added to those areas. Under the previous approval this was asphalt entries, and now they're pavers. Color-wise and material-wise, they're somewhat indicative of the pavers that run throughout

the project, however they are not permeable; they're not permeable pavers, just a solid surface as was there within the original approval.

The second modification that has occurred is, there's been a walkway added ...

**Chairman Cameron:** Could you actually back that board up? Most of our audience is right there in that little camera right behind you, over your shoulder, on the wall.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** OK, I was wondering where that was. I saw "broadcast live," but OK.

**Chairman Cameron:** That would be great, thank you.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** So item number one of the changes tonight are the pavers.

Item number two, there was a walkway added to the north side of the affordable building, building B, located in the middle of the site. That was predominantly driven by a meter room having to be added here throughout our final design work with United Water, which is now SUEZ Water. That's the utility provider for this area for potable water. This walk was added to service this water meter room on this side of the building.

The third change for discussion tonight is the shift in the amenity area. As you recall previously, there was a gathering plaza that was programmed for this area in here, which was to the north side of building B. Martin thought that concept was quite cramped into this area, it was a very tight space. So what he had proposed doing was adding some pedestrian connectivity throughout here, putting a gazebo more centrally located here towards the frontage of the project where the roadways are, and a little – I'll call it – seating barbecue area.

Along with that – and this looks very linear and curvilinear – there was an intention here to provide some means of access down to the riverbank. He felt that people are naturally going to want to walk down there and go see the edge of the river and whatever else may be occurring down there. Even though this looks like a more formal type walkway system, it's intended to be stones laid intermittently in the existing grade and grass, just like a stepping stone type element from this point down. These walks were obviously more of a hardscape treatment here.

The fourth thing we're going to be discussing tonight. As you recall, the dumpster enclosure for the project used to be over here kind of tucked behind building C. We are now proposing to relocate that in this general area here, which is the edge of this parking area. The primary driver for that plan modification, I believe, was the vicinity to the units. It's kind of right out

somebody's unit there where the dumpster enclosure ...

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Wasn't it actually ...

**Chairman Cameron:** It was farther up, actually.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** It was kind of tucked right in here.

**Chairman Cameron:** No, no.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** It was on the south side of building C, on the corner.

**Leo Torres, chief architect - GDC:** It was right here.

**Chairman Cameron:** Right there, yes.

**Mr. Torres:** There were two driving reasons for that shift. The first one was, it's really close to the building, to the units. But also, we felt that if we moved it to that location we could then shift some of the parking for the path – for the bike path and the connection to the county trailway – a bit closer to the bridge. So it helped us in two ways. It got the trash further away from the building, but it also got some of that recreation parking space closer to the actual recreation itself.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** We did, if I'm correct, maintain the same parking count here. Nothing's changed with parking. We still have the same handicapped accessibility here. Those are the basic ...

**Mr. Torres:** The wall, Joe.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** The wall.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** On the north.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** The walls, well yeah. This retaining wall here, that's at the northern end of the project. It sort of encompasses a landscape berm feature, a buffer – a side yard buffer berm – here. That used to be broken. I don't recall exactly where. It was two walls that kind of were broken and split. And now it's proposed that that is a continuous wall.

Just showing this in a little more detail or a little further-enlarged version, the amenity area here has been redesigned. You'll see this is the gazebo area, and this is the barbecue area.

Leo has some ... do you have a further detailed drawing of that somewhere here?

**Mr. Torres:** Yeah, we have them.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Not the renderings, but the drawing? Do we have that?

**Mr. Torres:** No, that's what you have.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Obviously, this is a rendering ...

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Leo, could you hold that up for the Board so the members can see it, please?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Or put it on top of the other board.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Yeah, put it in there. That's good.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Did we have one or two of these, Leo? Here, obviously, you can see the design intent, or rather perspective, of what we're proposing to do here. Was there another shot of this, Leo, or is this it?

**Mr. Torres:** Yes. Then we just have two sections cut through the site showing the grade. This would be the seating/fire pit area and this is the barbecue gazebo. This here would be the extents (ph) to the river, this the extents (ph) of the sidewalk, and these are the extents (ph) of the driveway. Likewise river, walk, driveway.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** All the more or less hardscape and feature improvements are out of the 100-year floodplain. The only thing that would be within are these grass stepping stones that I'd indicated on the previous drawing here. Unfortunately we don't have the exact line on here. But it does, as we know, run up into this area here, the 100-year floodplain line.

This is a little further enlargement of the refuse collection area. As we had indicated, we had shifted it from this area in here to here. I think Leo has a ... do you have a rendering of that as well?

**Mr. Torres:** This is the trash enclosure, the idea being that it would sort of be reminiscent of the architecture of the building but a more subdued and sort of played-down form in keeping with the other buildings.

**Chairman Cameron:** How tall is that?

**Mr. Torres:** Basically, we designed it so it has a sloped roof running towards the back, then 8 foot clear in the back for our trusses, and then the roof. So in front these doors are 8 feet. You've got about another 2 feet on top of that. So it's about 10 feet to the top of the parapet.

**Chairman Cameron:** And these are swinging doors that swing out.

**Mr. Torres:** Right. Generally, we use swing doors for our trash sheds because it works better with the rolling out of the trash containers and the loading on the trucks and what have you.

**Chairman Cameron:** I have a couple of comments. Can I go through this? Going over to the sidewalk you added to the side of the affordable housing building – you have to go back to the drawing for this ...

**Mr. Torres:** Oh, the other side.

**Chairman Cameron:** It seems to me, I looked at that and I said here we have all these nice, gracious, curved little pathways you put all over the place, and then you come up with this thing that's a sidewalk coming out of the yard or something. It's just straight. And it seems to me it'd be a lot easier if that exit from that building actually joined to your nice curving path. In other words, it went straight north, more or less, and joined your curvy path and headed over towards the sidewalk. You'd have a lot less pervious surfaces, it would ... the kids coming out of that back door, you know, you're just asking them to turn and run up your path.

So I think it'd just look a lot nicer if you ... and that nice person from SUEZ is probably going to do this by remote anyway because he has a ... at least that's what I have in my basement. They don't get into my basement so I doubt they're going to get into yours too much. But it would just make it curved up there, and join that other path and go that way I think would be ...

**Mr. Torres:** We could certainly add a curve to it. But these paths here, the idea with those paths is that they would be more of an informal walking path. Joe mentioned there was a hardscape, but we're really thinking it's sort of a gravel kind of pavement, something that's completely pervious. That way it would indicate a path, but we're not thinking it's a sidewalk per se. This path here, it's a utilitarian path so it has to be a concrete paved walkway for the simple reason that this is also where ... so this is access to utilities, but this is also where the maintenance crews would pick up the trash. Then they'll bring it out to the sidewalk and then take it to the trash shed. It's also utilitarian.

**Chairman Cameron:** I don't think the affordable are having trash pickup, and that's a surprise to me.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** I understand. I spoke with Bruce about this the other day. He's on vacation now, any which way. As Leo said, even if there's a different pavement spec, specification, let's say, I do agree it's kind of sticking out.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, it'd be great if it went over. Because, quite frankly, the kids are going to go over it and you're just going to have a bare piece of grass between the back door and that curvy path.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Yeah, I can't dispute that.

**Chairman Cameron:** So you're just asking for bare grass.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Even if we continue that as concrete, or whatever the hard path is, and then start ...

**Chairman Cameron:** And it makes a nicer lawn in front of the other building, too.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Yeah. Now, I do understand there was this issue with trash collection.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yeah, I'm thrilled. I want all of them to do it.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** It's a service-related issue. We are having services, obviously, bring trash from this building down to the dumpster area, picking up the trash in this building. So we are including that middle spot trash pickup with our people to do that so we don't have a trash issue or trash hanging out of the building on the side.

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, because they'll all take the other path to the trash.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Yeah.

**Chairman Cameron:** Look, we're all human you know.

The second thing, and I don't think this is an issue but I just wanted to bring it up, if you go and look at drawing P-2, that has that whole area down there with access for a path down where you have that circle. It has it all in 10- to 18-inch or 20-inch high grass. But it does have a path, so I just want to make sure if we're going to put it in our approval that the fact

you have this circle isn't going to make it appear like it's being cut short. It's very specific, you said you can't cut it, and we want to make sure you get the true drainage in there so can keep that grass. If you look at P-2 you'll see all that there.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Yeah, that was really meant ... the engineers, when you're doing it on AutoCAD you can draw circles and squares and triangles. But to do something really informal is actually quite difficult. They draw a circle because it's easy but, in reality, it's just meant to be a very informal sort of walkaround.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, the only other thing I have – and this is not in P-2, but I'd welcome it if you did it – when you look at your circle, the bottom part of your circle like 80 percent has got this grass in it. There's a little top piece that doesn't because of the size. If you filled the whole thing with grass I think it would look a lot better. That's aesthetics, but it would look ... and it's not in P-2, but if you can add more grass we don't object to that. I just think it would look nice with the path with grass filling the entire thing on the inside, just from a visual point of view.

The only other thing I wanted to mention is that I was glad to hear you say the paths don't go in the 100-year floodplain – and this diagram here you go across the dotted line a couple times – you could shoot back and look at that. Your dotted line shows it not very much, but it is going across the back of building C. Right at the back of building C it goes across it the way you've laid it out.

**Mr. Torres:** Even though it's pervious, it's going to be completely pervious. It's not paved or anything. We were thinking just sort of a gravel kind of walkway, which is completely pervious.

**Chairman Cameron:** These look like laid (ph) rectangular stones.

**Mr. Torres:** Its engineers. It's just I don't think it's really drawn the right way. Even here, you can see it here in the rendering. He's trying to show it like a gravel kind of walkway. We've always intended it to be a finally informal kind of just gravel walk behind the buildings. It's not going to be paved at all.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I think you'll run into some accessibility issues by doing that. You need to have a surface that someone with mobility challenges can use so I think gravel doesn't cut it.

**Mr. Torres:** No, you don't necessarily ... that's not required by code for site features. I've discussed this with Erika Krieger, who's the head of the New York State Code Enforcement

Division, and accessibility isn't necessarily covered on site features. We can't level the world.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** No, I understand that. And it just be just like a general accommodation to address just out of kindness whether it's a code issue or not a code issue. But maybe what can be done here is that this ... at least getting to the feature itself, per se, this first little stretch of stuff, of a pathway here, is a more accessible surface.

**Chairman Cameron:** Don't get the impression we're not happy that you moved the barbecue over between B and C. I asked poor Bruce to do that four or five times and he wouldn't do it. I'm just saying you guys did it yourself – brilliant! But it was obvious you had to because there was so much space between B and C.

**Mr. Torres:** Is that what took Bruce so long here? No, we love Bruce.

**Chairman Cameron:** No, no. I love Bruce, too. It was near the end, and he didn't want one more thing. And I said, well, wouldn't it be better if it was between B and C.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** And it is.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, it's more space and that's wonderful. So I'm in favor of that.

That's the end of my comments. I'm still a little confused. Is this just the drawing that shows these rectangular stones going down?

**Mr. Torres:** Yes.

**Chairman Cameron:** And you're going to do the gravel down there, too?

**Mr. Torres:** Well, down there we wanted sort of an informal stepping stone.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** I spoke to Martin today. This was just like to be something that physically you step one foot. But, you know, it's surrounded by all the natural grass.

**Mr. Torres:** Grass and what have you.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, another nice feature in the drawing P-2 was that down in that area you have large what you referred to as "sitting logs (ph)." I don't want old ladies to fall off of them or older guys. But that's all.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I'm such a fanatic when it comes to trash [background noise] crazy. I really don't care for the new location of your trash building. The reason is, people now come in to use the bridge, which looks quite nice, that's going in as well as driving in to take advantage of the parking spaces and leaving your bikes and all that good stuff. I'm feeling with that structure kind of directly straight on as you drive in, you're going to feel like you're going into the service yard of a building. That bothers me that that's going to be the thing you see.

The previous location wasn't a favorite of mine, but at least someone coming in, driving in to take advantage of the park or else take advantage of the bridge to the pathway, you'll be able to see where they're going. Right now, I think they'll drive in and be confused as whether this is a public space or sort of a private service space. That's my objection to it.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Do you have any suggestion for that issue? I mean, is there room enough that you can actually kind of screen around this and make it not as intrusive as the front non-visual?

**Mr. Torres:** We were trying to make it something nicer than sort of an ugly trash shed, right? I totally understand where you're coming from. There's not a lot of places for us to put it because this is tight, this is tight.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Personally, I think it should go back into the previous area.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Just one thing I need to interject. The fire department is very happy with the new location. They feel the garbage shed being that close to the building – because dumpster fires are prevalent – it would be a safer location if it was further away from the building. Not that I'm saying it has to be there, but they do like the fact that they want to propose to move it away from the building.

**Chairman Cameron:** I was just going to say we could put it out by the entrance. Just kidding.

**Mr. Torres:** I can totally understand your objection to it. If we had another place we'd absolutely put in another place, but we're really tight here. This is really the only side of the building ...

**Mr. Gigaleski:** [Off-mic] planning, it was right in this area.

**Chairman Cameron:** No, it was right there.

**Mr. Torres:** It was right here.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** I do see, though, kind of the straight-on appearance of it. That's why I was asking him.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** You guys are really going to have to share the mic, I'm sorry. Unless you want to drag the other one over.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I have a question. With the old location, the trash trucks would be ... where would they be when they're loading up the cans? Where would they be parked?

**Mr. Torres:** The old location, basically what we had – because we have to have a certain number of trash bins – this shape is sort of a square so it reduces our frontage. When we put it here, given the shape of this island, we had a long, skinny trash shed which would have necessitated larger doors. The trash truck, to answer your question, would have been right in the driveway. They would have pulled out these bins one at a time from that long shed. Then they would close it back up, and when they were done then they'd go. And, you know, trash guys are trash guys: they're going to go when they're ready to go. So, again, I understand the objection but it wasn't great.

**Boardmember Alligood:** So that was just something I was thinking. That the trucks would be standing there kind of blocking that. I'm not sure it's solved by where you have it because I'm not sure anyone could get around it even there.

**Mr. Torres:** Right.

**Boardmember Alligood:** But it would be kind of away from the building. I personally don't have a problem with the new location.

**Chairman Cameron:** Right. Do we have something better for doors? Can you guys dream of something better for doors?

**Mr. Torres:** We can do pretty doors. We were showing a sort of privacy door. The renderers showed it in a light gray; I was thinking I would like to pick more of a ... you know, sort of do the same two-tone color scheme where the doors were that color and the body was that color – you know, the walls were that color. But we can definitely do a pretty door.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** All these things definitely have to be addressed at ARB anyway.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yeah, I understand. That's why we have some ideas. The obvious thing to not discourage people would be an hourly parking, but I'm not suggesting that here.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I appreciate Buddy's point. I guess my feeling is that they put trash rules in buildings with trash, and say the building isn't the original location it's just firing it. You know, it's a two-hour wall. And God bless it, it's going to do a good job.

**Mr. Torres:** I hear you, I understand.

**Chairman Cameron:** So if we do leave it where it is, you see the five trees you're very nicely putting on our property along the property line. If you could put another one, not as big, on the other side of the trash bin between us and the field ...

**Mr. Torres:** Sure.

**Chairman Cameron:** ... so at least people are on the field and use the field, they won't be looking at the trash bin building as much would be an improvement.

**Mr. Torres:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** I know I'm going to make everyone mad, but why couldn't we move that onto the green spot, put another tree to its east, and put landscaping around it so it's not visually disconnecting from River Road. It does encroach on our open space, but ...

**Chairman Cameron:** You can put it on Village property.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Bring it on Village property.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** I know, putting it on Village property.

**Chairman Cameron:** I thought of moving it straight back 20 feet onto a piece of Village property we don't really need, but that still doesn't do any good. I think make the building look better. Do we want to put a sloped roof on the trash building just to make it look like it's not a trash shed. That's what we're trying to do essentially. Surprise the ARB; we'll bring it up with them, how you can make it look less like trash.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** We toyed with the idea of putting a sloped roof on it. The main buildings have all flat roofs. We do obviously have a sloped roof on the barbecue gazebo, but the reason we didn't do it here is because we need the clearance we need inside. We need 8 feet

clear, that's it. What's going to happen is, from that point then you're going to go up. It's going to make it sort of a more conspicuous building. We were trying to make it as inconspicuous as possible and sort of recessed into the background as much as possible. But a sloped roof is definitely a possibility.

**Chairman Cameron:** The ARB people have a better idea instead of grasping for straws. Any other comments?

**Boardmember Bass:** This is the last suggestion. You see where the tree is, where you had your finger originally, that tree? Move that east and put the shed where the tree is.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** That's where it was.

**Boardmember Bass:** That's where it was?

**Mr. Torres:** The problem is, we're basically going to need those six containers we have in there, and here we get to do two-deep. If we do it here, then what happens is we have six wide; the building's going to be six containers long because we have to get six containers in there.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** It'd also make it more obvious, wouldn't it?

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Right. You get a lot more frontage of this thing.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** You could take the size of the footprint of the building and put it in the area Richard's talking about, and gain back ... you took, I think, about two parking spaces worth of real estate down there. You could put it up there in its compact configuration.

**Mr. Torres:** In here you mean?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Yeah.

**Chairman Cameron:** Or you could use that and take one parking spot to make sure you had room for it. Because we'd be gaining the two parking spots where your trash dumpster is now.

**Mr. Torres:** The other thing for us was to try to get as far away from the building as possible. That was definitely a goal.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** But I'm kind of fighting for the people who will be coming to use this and don't want to look in the trash building, as nice as the one you're showing in your rendering.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I'm also thinking, for the trash, that the Village may be going to automated mechanical arm pickup of trash as occurs in many other communities. The original trash location would've much more amenable to that by having it one-deep as opposed to having these three-by-two. I'm sort of wondering if you could have the six-by-one arrangement in this location, but going along the east-west line so the long side would be going east-west.

**Mr. Torres:** I'm not sure we could do that without blocking the drive or going onto Village property.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Is there enough room for a garbage truck to turn around? I mean, you said they stay as long as they will, but they also park wherever they want when they're doing their job. Wherever it is it's still going to be tight, isn't it?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** On a dead end street. Or not a dead end street, they back in.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Yeah, they're going to be backing into the spot.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** They do it on my street every day, or I should say every week.

**Boardmember Bass:** And they're only there for five minutes per week.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Hopefully.

**Chairman Cameron:** You're going to have two trash pickups a week, or just one? Do you know?

**Mr. Gigaleski:** I'm not sure.

**Mr. Torres:** I'm not sure either. I think we spoke about two during the approval process.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Well, I think having a tree where you've got the tree placed gives it some coverage.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I'd like you to look at taking that compact footprint and putting it back in the area it was. I think it's a little thing, but it's going to be a big thing down the road

for people using that public parking and getting access to the trail.

**Mr. Torres:** Putting it back up here?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Because it really took this whole area of frontage here.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I know, but if you take the same shape and just turn it 90 degrees I think you can sneak it in there pretty well.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** You mean having the doors open onto the driveway?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Yep.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** But the driveway has a grade going down to get underneath the buildings.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** No, no, no, I don't mean facing the ...

**Mr. Torres:** The doors opening this way.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Correct.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yeah, facing north-south.

**Mr. Torres:** Yeah, the only rub is – we just have to look into it – this does have a slope going down. And we have to make sure we have enough space, for structural purposes in terms of the slope of the grade, where this is and where that is. But we'll look at it. It's probably OK, but we have to look at it.

**Mr. Torres:** The other thing Martin becomes sensitive to is, when he's got some opportunity in a space like this that's where he likes to heavily plan landscape and do kind of futuristic type additional landscape.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Right, but people are zooming in and out of their driveway at that point.

**Chairman Cameron:** It'll be concentrating going up and down that ramp.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I can't say I feel strongly about it either way. But I do think that if it was pushed out to the driveway then it's very obviously a trash place. I think if it was out

on the driveway, opposed to where it is now, it really is obvious that it's a trash – what do you call it? – "room container." So I'm less inclined to have it out there in my own mind.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** And you could put landscaping between the existing trash location and the building. You have space for that as well.

**Mr. Torres:** You mean if we put the trash in here could we still put landscaping here?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Oh, yeah.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes.

**Mr. Torres:** Yes, we could. And we would have to because of its proximity. This right here is about 27 feet so we're talking about 27.30, maybe -.34 feet to face our building, which is not that far.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Maybe the thing to do is cut a section through there, and just understand grade-wise that this is going down and this is going down. So this thing that's going to be somewhat of an extended feature is not really necessarily on a flat piece. It's kind of like in this multi cross-slope situation here. This is obviously an easier landing pad to create the flat. I mean, I understand you point that it does have a visual element here when you access the park.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** We just have different perspectives.

**Mr. Torres:** And, in fairness, we could put really nice doors or what have you. It would look like a shed of some type, but at least we could put doors where it wouldn't look like necessarily a trash shed, per se. Because we wouldn't put open-grate doors, we wouldn't put a standard roll-up door. What we're showing is sort of a privacy barn door type of configuration. That's kind of the idea.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I just want to say I'm sympathetic to people wanting the trash as far as possible away from their building. I know that in some cases it's not possible to do that, but I understand why the owner wants to do that and don't have a problem with your location.

**Chairman Cameron:** But it may be – and God help you with our garbagemen – that what you need is doors which are part metal on the outside but there are metal ones inside so people don't ... you'd probably have to go down there and open them yourself every day. But the garbagemen come and there's no latch.

**Mr. Torres:** We have to do trash often, so what we typically do is we don't do a metal door. We'll do either like a solid PVC or something nicer so it looks like wood from further away but can take a beating and doesn't rust, we never have to paint it. You know, you pick nice color and you're one and done. That's typically what we do.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** It's also, too – if I just may add, and this is going to piggyback in some of our later discussion on the next agenda item – we sort of looked at all this in a vacuum, the site itself. So we do have a parcel, obviously, to do that over here. But, you know, I don't really know what the outcome of the fate of the parcel's going to be. You're going to hear some discussion later on the next agenda item about maybe some things that could be along this larger stretch on Saw Mill.

I don't know, this discussion about some potential access for kayaking and things of that nature, and maybe this just doesn't become a garbage shed element like we're looking at it now. It ultimately could become larger and incorporates a use into the parcel next door with a Village use for whatever this parcel's going to be someday.

I mean, I don't know if there's been any discussion or contemplation about that, but we are kind of looking at it in the fine line. Not to say we're looking to put this on Village property, but I'm just saying this might be something that becomes more of a structure for something.

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, I have to tell you I think the bridge looks very nice that you've put in there. I'm a little puzzled by the fact that you're going to be building the buildings in a different order than you first brought them up with us. I'm curious why. You were going to build A first and then C. It was Michael. The lawyers always do that. But anyway, I'm just curious why A is being built last.

**Mr. Torres:** I don't know how much discussion there was on the construction duration here. There's not going to be much lag between completion of this and completion of that. Because it's rolling, as you see, right down the street. The foundation's going in, this building's going up next; there's not going to be a huge amount of land. Obviously it was important, I think – as it related to conditions of the approval and whatnot – that it be completed to start to obtain COs down the road. That's kind of that sequence.

**Chairman Cameron:** Since you brought up COs, I was going to, too. If you looked at the resolution we passed – which you have a copy of which goes on for about 40 pages – one of the things you asked us for, and this isn't a problem but could be a problem later on and is not an issue, well, please don't hold up our building; we'll do all the five agreements you need later. So what you have is a condition to getting your CO. At least four or five agreements

being drafted by you and approved by the Village Attorney and by us.

Then on the back of the document there's a two-page list of terms that goes into each agreement. Just so you're not caught by surprise, you should go and take a look at that and work on the agreements. Because I don't want you guys to come in here ... all we need is – well, I was thinking of poor Buddy over here – we need our CO right now, we got 10 buyers. But sorry, guys, you haven't done the agreements you made.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** That's great. We'll definitely look into that because we were really focused on the conditions required to obtain the building permits.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yes, right.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** I think we got all those ironed out.

**Chairman Cameron:** You'll see the list.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** OK, I'll make sure we're on top of that.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** So leave the building where it is? Is that what we're hearing?

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, I don't know. We'll just get people's view.

**Boardmember Bass:** I've become agnostic.

**Chairman Cameron:** Agnostic, OK. You're OK with the building where it is? Did I hear that, or not?

**Boardmember Alligood:** You mean the newly proposed, not where it was. There was a new one and yes, I'm OK with it.

**Boardmember Bass:** I'm OK with it, too, actually.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I'm OK with it.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I guess I can be OK with it.

**Mr. Torres:** We're going to put some thought into the elevation and the doors.

**Chairman Cameron:** And the quality of the material on the outside. Like the person who

has the penthouses where he keeps the car, and they don't have a penthouse.

**Mr. Torres:** Look, either our residents and customers or the public, it's all the same. I mean, we don't want anything to look visually obtrusive. There was no public component here. Let's say this was all private. We wouldn't want our residents coming in and ...

**Chairman Cameron:** So the one thing I might say to you is that you have a 2 by 3 foot sign at the end of the driveway saying there's parking there. If we end up with nobody ever parking there and never coming in there, we might be after you for a bigger sign. But we do want it used, we want people to go on the river and walk across the bridge.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I want to echo that my biggest concern is that it feels inviting and public enough that people will feel they're able to use the space.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Exactly. That's why, also, we feel it's important that at some point in time we engage in some conversation with this next door. Because it may get to the point where maybe there's not enough parking here. Then what do we do? People want to come down, they can't find a spot, people get frustrated. That's not good either. That gets into kind of the bigger picture thing I was discussing earlier here, which I don't know where it is now in our discussion today.

**Chairman Cameron:** Come back and talk to us.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I have some comments I'd like to make.

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, go ahead.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Regarding the wall that you're proposing at the north end of the property, it's just a 2-foot high wall. I'm not sure why you could not put it in and just use contouring of the property there. I'm not sure what having ...

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, it's 2 feet on their side; it's much higher on the other side of that.

**Mr. Torres:** Yeah, and we do have some ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** No, I'm not worried about that. I'm talking about the wall where it curves as it approaches Saw Mill River Road at the end there.

**Chairman Cameron:** The long wall that you made two walls into one.

**Mr. Torres:** The idea for that wall was that we were going to be able to ... because right here, that's an existing industrial use. So we're trying to get ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I don't have a problem with a wall, exactly, on the north end.

**Mr. Torres:** This here.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I have a problem with that part, where it curves. I don't see a need. Why not just use a contour, have the land contoured there?

**Mr. Torres:** It was contoured, I presume, from the original approval here. It had kind of a weird break, though. You had one wall that went off in this direction and then one wall that went off in this direction, and I think also – correct me if I'm wrong – we have an entry wall here. It was kind of more or less a symmetry item.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** My concern about having a wall on both sides of that property as opposed to having land on the north end there is, it tends to exclude people from going in there. Even if you did have a wall there I would want to have steps or something for people. Because it's a 2-foot high wall and people don't climb up 2 feet readily.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, nobody's supposed to be on that end of the building.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Right.

**Chairman Cameron:** Unfortunately, that stuff north of that dotted line there is actually there's an easement to the building next door.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** This section.

**Mr. Torres:** Yeah. This area here which is shown as green is actually the engineer mistaken ... I understand what you're saying, but the engineer mistakenly colored this in as green. It's actually the asphalt pavement. This portion of the wall here, the reason we added the wall here is because we're trying to build this whole thing up high enough. That we didn't feel we had enough space in here to properly grade it up. You know, we get another 2 feet in height at the front.

I understand what you're saying: can you do it with contours. Just so you know, we like walls because we do hand-cut, field-built beautiful stone walls. I mean, you can see it on our projects in Harvest Square, at Haverstraw. We do really beautiful walls, and we spend,

actually, a lot of money doing the stone walls because we really like them.

We thought it would be beautiful, A. But B, it also gets that berm that we're trying to create that privacy barrier between the industrial use and our residential use ... it gets that berm up higher and allows us to start the planting higher. But I understand what you're saying, can you do it without contours. Or can you do it with contours and without a wall. When we were working on it we didn't find that we could, but we could look at it again.

**Chairman Cameron:** One of the things about the asphalt over the other side, when it was explained to us initially this was to give the adjacent building a right of way to bring your trucks around behind the building. But then when you look at it, you discover they're using it as a storage area. When we talked to them – I mean, it wasn't Bruce, it was somebody else – they said they were going to get rid of that stuff that's being stored over there, and I wonder where you are on that progress.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** That's something we have to look into, yeah.

**Chairman Cameron:** Because that's your real problem. You're storing things and stacking them kind of high.

**Mr. Torres:** Right.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Again, I'm not trying to provide access from your property into that right of way section. I'm not trying to provide that. I'm trying to just allow access for your residents to go between the north end of your building onto that part. That's why I'd like to see either stairs or a contoured approach.

**Mr. Torres:** Just so you know – and we can look at it, we will look at it – that area right now is actually contoured pretty heavily. The idea was for it to be planted fairly densely with evergreen and things like that just to keep people kind of out of there and create the barrier. I understand what you're saying; we'll look at it.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes, if you have it planted that way. But even if you do put a wall in it would still sort of be more welcoming to have stone steps that go up there. You know, like you're not actually being excluded. Because you can certainly access it from the west side. That area is accessible from the west side, especially if you go out the west exits or your building.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Michael, I was thinking it might be helpful getting a 3-dimensional rendering of that area to understand it.

**Mr. Torres:** Excuse me. I think I can just make it work. I think what brought attention to this – this curvilinear thing that got created with the continuous wall – was just a complete ... if you look on the original plan, I mean, that wall configuration looks sort of erratic. One wall goes one way, the other wall goes the other, and there's really ... it doesn't create sort of relation here.

But I think you're asking, on this 2-foot issue, if I can break the wall somewhere and still maybe give it some level of curbing in here and some level of curbing in here, but that provides some little openness so there's a contoured break instead of a wall break. I think I can accommodate that.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** OK.

**Mr. Torres:** If that kind of addresses it.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I mean, if you really do want to have a continuous wall there, if you just break it by providing three 7-inch steps or something like that to make the 2 feet.

**Mr. Torres:** Sometimes walls that die into contours are interesting. You know, if you go up to the Storm King Art Center and you see the wall that goes into the pond and out the other side I think that's kind of where you're going. But you want to see it with contours and some grading and some level of break there. OK.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I still would like to repeat my original request when you were doing the sidewalks here. I really think you should seriously think about putting a sidewalk all along the eastern edge of your property where it borders the Saw Mill River Road. I think having the bus stop at the northern end is going to attract people to walk along there, whether it be from the buildings, the offices, across the road, or even any possible development further to the south. I really would like to see a sidewalk there.

**Mr. Torres:** If I could comment on that, this is kind of where I got in after Bruce left off. I spent a lot of time working – and Inspector Minozzi knows – with the DOT here. The DOT isn't the most outwardly cooperative group and, you know, they're difficult at times. We had this discussion about – or I think there was a request maybe by this board or I'm not sure who – about this crosswalk that goes across the street here. We were to ask the DOT some questions on that. The DOT is definitely not a proponent of promoting pedestrian type activity along their highways. That's issue number one.

I think from a design perspective, the intent to kind of bring people in the project and out the

other way instead of along a highway. And, hopefully, that's the path that's chosen. But I know in my dealings with even getting our curbcut permits for this – which we had preexisting curbcuts – there were many months of work we went through with the DOT that started the year before we started building this project. So I'm not quite certain, when you talk about some additional sidewalks on the eastern edge here, what exactly you would be looking for or asking of in terms of additional walks. Are you talking about a walk along the road itself?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes, exactly.

**Chairman Cameron:** We did get, actually, included in our terms – you'll find it – that people who get off the bus there actually could walk down that sidewalk if they're going to our parking area and over the bridge. You'll find that in the 42-page document I referred to.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Was the intent to bring the people in?

**Chairman Cameron:** If they're going to that parking lot. We just said we couldn't have them coming off the bus there and then walking down the road and turning into the southern entrance. But it's got to be for people who are actually going to that parking lot. It can't be just for anybody who decides to walk down the road. I'd love to have a sidewalk, too, but how are they going to get a sidewalk and four lanes in on that road?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** No, I certainly hope they don't put in four lanes.

**Chairman Cameron:** I know, but the DOT's under pressure to put in a wider road.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Usually they run and hide and don't really come out and talk about other things. Look, it's like any other agency we deal with. We have to ultimately get together and have some results.

**Chairman Cameron:** I will tell you, as an aside, I went over and testified on the Jefferson, which is up the road from you, the one on Lawrence Street. I suggested that the town actually use yours as an example of what the density should allow on their site, which would get them down even less than the number of units you have. I think they're going to make them ...

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** This sidewalk issue had come up in the Planning Board approval the first time and it was chosen not to do it.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I do remember. I just wanted to make that statement again.

**Chairman Cameron:** All right. So can we have a motion?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** We didn't discuss the center of the two: the barbecue pit and the meeting area.

**Mr. Torres:** No, we talked about it. I didn't know if there was any comment or question.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** We didn't have any comments on that. I was just keeping my notes.

**Chairman Cameron:** I assume what we're going to see when we have the agreements on access to the property is that the people in all three buildings have access to both of these and the circle down below.

**Mr. Torres:** We look at this as one project here. There's no limit just because it's an inclusionary component.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I'd like to just make an observation. This is not a requirement or anything. But since the path you're proposing curves close to the southern side of building B where there's an entrance to that building, and also to the western side of building C where there are also two entrances, maybe you could connect the pathways to those three exits. Just as a thought

**Chairman Cameron:** Three exits in which one, building ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** B. There's an entrance on the south end, and then there's two entrances from the west side of building C.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Is that a path? That's all they do is go to a path?

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, the kids are going to come out of that ...

**Mr. Torres:** Yeah, I don't think there's any problem with that.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Just a thought.

**Mr. Torres:** No, I think it's a good thought.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I have no other comment.

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, any other comment?

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I just have a question. I guess I have two questions on the diagrams you provided us. You have a triangle with a numeral "7" on it in various places. Does that have any meaning?

**Mr. Torres:** No, the triangles are called "revision tags." They are representative of changes that were made during the process, after we submitted the drawings. There were various revisions that would have been made, and those tags just indicate where they were made.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Right. Because there was no notation on the diagrams as to what they were, and I was trying to understand them.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I just want to actually say I think the amenity that you're expecting people to use and create a sense of community amongst the three buildings, you know, that may be a very active use. A lot of people may be throwing barbecue parties, and I think there sometimes developers discourage people from using the public spaces. So I want to say I think that's a nice touch you're putting in there.

**Mr. Torres:** Thank you. What we find in our developments – you know, we do apartments, well, mostly apartments, 99 percent apartments – is that the number one request from residents is an outdoor area. Typically it's a barbecue, right? They always want a barbecue area. And if they can have somewhere ... you know, these fire pits nowadays are very, very popular. We'll have to spec out exactly what we're going to do, but just having a place to sit and be outside and the fire's going. I have it in my backyard.

**Chairman Cameron:** Is that a gas barbecue?

**Mr. Torres:** We haven't decided exactly how to do it yet. At other projects ... we have a project in Yonkers, a smaller project, 1177, and that's on top of a garbage roof deck, where we're creating sort of landscaped roof garden for the entire building to enjoy. There, we're actually specifying a gas one because it's on the building. Here, I think we'd probably do a gas one. Because having wood logs might be a bit much.

**Chairman Cameron:** Are we done? We're going to have to fill this in.

Sorry, what?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** I was just saying something to Linda.

**Chairman Cameron:** Can we listen?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** What I was saying to Linda is, I know we have to go to the ARB for everything, and does the Board recommend that any of this have to go to Hahn?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I don't think there's really any engineering impact to any of these changes.

**Chairman Cameron:** I think there's nothing on that.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** On that, what you need to say is that the changes don't result in any significant adverse impact that you haven't already reviewed

**Chairman Cameron:** We still actually have to stick in the names and dates of the drawings and some little caveats. But you'll see the whole thing, and I don't think you'll be surprised.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** The amendments don't result in potential significant adverse environmental impacts that you haven't already considered and updated.

**Chairman Cameron:** So can I have a person make that motion?

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Happy to.

On MOTION of Boardmember O'Reilly, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board:

Resolved that the Planning Board hereby amends its Previously Approved Site Plan for the Saw Mill River Lofts, approving the modifications to certain site improvements as set for in the following drawings as submitted to this meeting numbered and dated as follows: (G-1 1/22/26; G-1A 2/18/16; G-1B 2/18/16; S-12/18/16; S-1A 2/18/16; and S-1B 2/18/16, here the "Drawings") with the following modifications thereto (1) to remove a suggested pathway from the north side door of Building B going directly east and to the add pathways from the side doors of Buildings B & C to join the newly proposed pathways (2) to have the pathways redrawn so as to not pass into or through the 100 year flood plain and (3) to make and return with modifications to the building containing the relocated dumpster; and Resolved further, and consistent with the past reviews of the design of Saw Mill River Lofts, the Planning Board asks that the Architectural Review Board review all the modifications that are set forth in the Drawings including those being proposed by the

Planning Board and provide the Planning Board with its advice; and asks that the Applicant Ginsburg Development Companies, LLC return to the Planning Board with the Drawings as modified above taking into consideration the modifications made by the Planning Board and the advice of the Architectural Review Board for further consideration by the Planning Board; and

Resolved further, that the Planning Board, as lead agency, hereby determines under SEQRA that the changes being made do not result in any significant adverse impacts that haven't been reviewed and previously considered by the Planning Board.

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, thank you very much.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Thank you. If I could just add one more general note for the Board. It occurred to me recently – and this didn't always use to be the case – it's kind of a planning and life safety issue that does occur. As you know, United Water is the potable water provider in the area.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** SUEZ.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** SUEZ now.

**Chairman Cameron:** You can send them a check with "United Water" on it.

**Mr. Torres:** Exactly. It did occur to us – and this was a little odd I thought – that there were two fire hydrants prescribed for this particular project. Come to find out, there are significant annual usage fees associated with those hydrants, obviously dictated through SUEZ now, which is a little ... I know there's no price on safety and whatnot. But to kind of burn the end user, whoever it may be – whether it's us or some other development or commercial user – excuse me?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** That charge is now on our water bills.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Yeah, and it's a little odd of a charge. You know, we've done a lot of projects with United Water on this side of the river and in Rockland County and we never used to see that.

**Chairman Cameron:** We moved that to all our individual bills. Unless you do it that way, there are a lot of not-for-profit organizations that never pay because it's in the taxes. We just exported it into the water bills instead of having it our taxes so not-for-profit institutions can

contribute their fair share of the fire hydrants we have to have in the town. That's why. You wanted to know why.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Well, it was the Village Trustees who did that. They also did it because the rate of increases for the fire hydrants was increasing and it's still increasing. But, however, the downside is that when it was part of the Village taxes people who are paying the Village taxes could deduct it, which they cannot do anymore.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** It's just a peculiar surcharge from a developer's standpoint.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** It applies to ...

**Mr. Gigaleski:** If they assess it in a water usage charge and increase the water usage charge, so be it. But being that they charge a hydrant, for a cost-effective developer it's ...

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** They're not doing it on your individual hydrants.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Yeah, you would have been charged that if those hydrants were there or not.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** It's spread across all users.

**Chairman Cameron:** And you're better off to ... you could deduct the water [unintelligible]. We can't. So be grateful for that one.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** It's not necessarily geared towards your two hydrants.

**Mr. Torres:** It is quite expensive, though, I must say.

**Chairman Cameron:** You want three hydrants?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Wait 'til you see your service charge for the sprinkler lines.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

### **Groundwork Hudson Valley - Thoughts and Ideas about Programs on the Sawmill River along the Saw Mill Lofts Project**

**Mr. Gigaleski:** As part of the next item here, I'd like to introduce who we've been working with, Groundworks (sic) Hudson Valley. Rick is here tonight, their executive director. Martin and Rick have had some discussion, and Martin's very interested in some of the great work they've been doing along the Saw Mill River. There's been some discussion that since we have a sizeable frontage along the Saw Mill River that their group may want to get involved and look at some unique opportunities here.

**Chairman Cameron:** The back of build A is terrific.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Obviously we're a sponsor of the program. We're going to get involved in the vine-cutting work and all that other good stuff. I'm going to turn it over to Rick and he can kind of talk about what he's thought about with our project here.

**Rick Magder, executive director – Groundwork Hudson Valley:** Thank you, Joe. We're really happy to be working with GDC, Ginsburg and Martin. I actually live in Martin's building on Warburton.

Groundwork was a ... I'm not sure if everyone knows, Groundwork, we did the ... we're based on Yonkers, we did the daylighting in the Saw Mill River. Our program, the Saw Mill River Coalition, we've been in operation for about 15 years. We also do the Science Barge ... you might know the Science Barge as well. We've had this about 10- to 15-year mission to restore the entire Saw Mill River watershed, really funded in part by New York State and the Westchester Community Foundation.

A lot of our work has been in Yonkers and we really kind of built up the river there. But we do a lot in Hastings. Some of you may know that at Farragut Avenue we do the Free-A-Tree vine-cutting program; we have the Great Saw Mill River Cleanup coming up in a few weeks. I've got a flier here for you if you want.

About two years ago we did a state-funded plan called the Saw Mill River Recreation Area and we were trying to really think of the area particularly north of the Yonkers line all the way to Willens Lake as a recreation area. Because there's some wetlands, there's real opportunity on the South County Trailway, there's a need to better connect the communities particularly on the west side of the highway to the South County Trailway. I'll leave one of these here, but we are trying to create better connections to the river, especially down Farragut Parkway, trying to maybe create a crossing there to the South County.

We've also had an idea, which we call out here, to go down Ravensdale and create a trail not on Saw Mill River Road, but kind of on the edge, to go to this new open space that would

prevent so many cars. Like the only way to get to this open space is by car, but there's really not necessarily a need. You could probably bike to it, as well, so that's something to consider.

**Chairman Cameron:** What about the old train station?

**Mr. Magder:** Through the old train station.

**Chairman Cameron:** The old train station right there, that's the way to go.

**Mr. Magder:** You mean right on the ...

**Chairman Cameron:** You go right through the woods, right over to the South County Trailway there.

**Mr. Magder:** Yeah. Anyway, we started working with GDC in the last few months to take a look at their site and see what we could do there. There's a lot of invasive vines, and I do have a drawing here that we put together. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the federal agency that oversees America's refuges, has designated the Saw Mill in Yonkers as a national wildlife refuge actually. We had Mayor Spano out there, and we have a lot of youth that get involved. We had the second in command of the Fish & Wildlife Service come down. They're very engaged in the Saw Mill River overall, and looking at can we put fish back in the stream, can we have a fishing program.

The site where Hastings Lofts are is a really great opportunity to build on the work at Farragut, build on the work in Yonkers, and build on this idea of a Saw Mill River recreation area. We've had the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service there, we've had the state DEC there, we've had our ecologists look at the site. And we're just starting to formulate some ideas of how we can turn not only the area immediately adjacent to the property, but going down towards Ravensdale as a much nicer area of trails, interpretation and kayak launches. Actually, we're probably going to be putting in a couple of kayak launches very soon. We have partnerships with LL Bean and REI. We just got a grant from REI to buy a bunch of kayaks.

So we're really excited about taking this site – particularly the edge that's not directly on their property – and turning it into a place where people can come to the river and really enjoy it.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** What are you going to do when you get to the Farragut Avenue bridge? Put up a big sign that says "duck"?

**Mr. Magder:** Which bridge, I'm sorry.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** The Farragut Avenue bridge on the Saw Mill River.

**Mr. Magder:** You mean Ravensdale?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Farragut Avenue, the next one down.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** The river goes from the east side to the west side of Saw Mill River Road.

**Mr. Magder:** Right.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Saw Mill River Parkway and Farragut.

**Mr. Magder:** We're building this, and then it comes back over.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes.

**Mr. Magder:** Right. We're not thinking of doing a lot on that side of the river. We're really focused on the connection between the South County Trailway and the river itself. If you go down to the Farragut site on the east side of Hastings we're putting in trails right now and actually doing a fair amount over there. But here, there's some really great opportunities.

You know, this bridge is beautiful. This was something we called out years ago, probably unknown to most people, to have a bridge that came over in this area. It's really a lovely amenity. We really are interested in the open space, too, and what's going to happen to it. There are opportunities to view the Saw Mill River. There's a couple of little tributaries that come in on and there's like a little bit of a ledge that looks over the Saw Mill River on the south side of the property. We'd like to partner with you guys and whatever the planning is around that open space.

We proposed to Ginsburg just some ideas of kind of innovative playgrounds. Our feeling is, what we really want, is for people to come over this bridge and go to an open space that has some dynamic element to it. Because if it's just kind of a boring, plain open space I don't think it's going to get a lot of utilization. People won't necessarily come over to go to it, kids won't necessarily come over to go up to just a few benches and a picnic area. But if it's something really unique, an adventure playground or the idea of a BMX site there. But I think that might be a little radical for Hastings.

**Chairman Cameron:** They've got to sell the apartments first.

**Mr. Magder:** Yeah, but something that's really unique up there because I think it's a tricky open space. It's along Saw Mill River Road and needs something really interesting that you don't get anywhere else for people to go up there.

We're working on this now. Just to summarize, we're working on repopulating fishing and fish populations along the property, we're looking at kayak and canoe launches, we're moving the invasive vines and replacing with natives at the site, and trying to find a way for people to bike into the area both from the Saw Mill River Road side safely and the South County Trailway side. So we're really thrilled to be partnering with these guys. I don't know if you have any questions about that.

**Chairman Cameron:** Just one thing I mentioned earlier. When you come over Ravensdale bridge you then have to go up the Saw Mill road. People go, I hate to say, 40 to 50 or more miles an hour on that road.

**Mr. Magder:** Right.

**Chairman Cameron:** But if you go about 40 feet north of the Ravensdale bridge, there is actually a road going in there and a bridge across the river which all belong to that particular train station. It's still there, and I think the bridge is still robust. While you're clearing those forests out, you could bring people in there. They could come over the Ravensdale bridge and then just bicycle right onto the trail and head north. It would be a wonderful way to get from their development coming south, and come across this bridge that's already there.

**Mr. Magder:** Right, I totally agree with you. I'm frequently running to soccer, making that left turn.

**Chairman Cameron:** And there's also room, potentially, for Westchester to put parking in there. There used to be parking in there. And I agree, I think the ground's still pretty solid. The one thing we lack is parking. We're worried about using our 10 parking spots, but if we put a BMX park in there they wouldn't have any parking for the tenants in their building.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** The area where you're talking about we actually put a BMX track in there when I was a kid.

**Chairman Cameron:** That's you.

**Mr. Magder:** Unofficial.

**Chairman Cameron:** I mean, that's the real area, quite frankly, to connect Hastings. Because right now, we have to come across Ravensdale and so south to that parking lot, and then come north again.

**Mr. Magder:** Yeah, we totally agree. I think we're going to try and write some funding proposals to do just that as this moves along. But Martin's been really great and Joe's been great, really thinking of this not just as a residential development but really a public space.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, I think Martin would be interested in that. Because then people living in the houses up there could actually go across his bridge, go south and go across the other bridge that's already there, and then bicycle over Ravensdale and be in Hastings. It'd be a nice little amenity, a nice connector.

**Mr. Magder:** Maybe one day it'll be a national wildlife refuge.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** One other thought. Years ago I did it once because I used to like to get to the South County, the old railway line, going up to Dobbs. Rather than drive my car and park in that lot where you usually would go and then start your walk right at the end of Farragut Avenue, if you walk across the Ravensdale bridge – and I did this once – turn around and came down that hill. I did it once and I'd never do it again because it needs a staircase. But it's a way of doing it where you can actually walk out of Hastings and do it quite easily. Whether we ever get to that point ... but it's just another thought and more direct than what you're describing.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, you come off the bridge and turn north.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** Just turn north and come straight down.

**Chairman Cameron:** You can turn north and walk maybe 40, 50 feet and then you're on the diagonal road going into the old railway parking lot. It's actually quite easy.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I'll have to look at that one day.

**Chairman Cameron:** And I'll go with you.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** I don't know the bridge. There's a bridge there actually.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yeah, there is.

**Mr. Magder:** I think you'd probably have to make the Ravensdale bridge a little safer in some ways for bikes.

**Chairman Cameron:** We build that right after we do the one in Dobbs Ferry.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** So the Ravensdale bridge is the state, not the county?

**Chairman Cameron:** But it's terrific.

**Boardmember Alligood:** That picture there looks pretty enticing to me, the one where you have access to the edge of the water.

**Mr. Magder:** And there's actually a lovely waterfall right at the northern edge.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** You know, Martin obviously wants to push this initiative ahead. And maybe it is more of a global look and not just, per se, a frontage along our project. Because I mentioned some other areas here tonight. We'd like to try to figure out a pathway. This was kind of an introduction to you guys tonight in how it could potentially relate to our site.

But obviously we'd like to progress this a little further down the road, develop some more concepts, see what other parties may be involved. The county obviously may ultimately express some involvement in this as well. I think we're going to kind of keep chipping away at whatever avenue we're directed toward in cooperation with the Village and various boards. We just want to kind of give that roundabout presentation here tonight.

**Chairman Cameron:** All right, thank you very much.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I just wanted to say I'm very much appreciative that Ginsburg is working with Groundwork Hudson Valley. Also, I was very pleased to see in the topographic map it shows the open space that you have in conjunction with the Saw Mill River Lofts. That the ground is not going to be completely flat but slightly concave. I was glad to see that, too.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** OK, so we'll keep everybody posted of our progress here.

**Chairman Cameron:** Thank you very much.

**Mr. Gigaleski:** Thank you.

**Mr. Magder:** Thank you.

## **VI. DISCUSSION**

### **Land Use Task Force Report**

**Chairman Cameron:** It's so early. We have two discussion items. One is the Land Use Task Force Report and the other is the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson Green Code. I would suggest, with your permission, that we actually go to the Green Code first, as we have another audience on the Green Code which is the Conservation Commission. We also have coming before us, perhaps at our next meeting 32-34 Warburton.

The one thing we have to resolve on 32-34 Warburton – but we may actually have a resolution on it – is to make sure what we approve for that site includes a shingle which is not blazing white nor some other reflective surface. Buddy and I have done a little talking, and I don't know if you've had a chance to talk to Linda. Also, Buddy went back to Christina Griffin and said please bring with you to the ARB when you go there some shingle which they're going to like and are not too reflective. I think that's going to happen.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Yeah, I had a nice long conversation with Christina about it, and they're definitely thinking in the brown family.

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, so we may have that problem solved. I was reading the Green Code, trying to figure out actually how Buddy could agree to one different than what the specifications say. Evidently there is a way, even though the language is pretty obtuse. Ironically enough, if they didn't like what Buddy said, the way the Green Code is set up, believe it or not, they have to go to the Board of Trustees and don't come to the Planning Board for something which, I think, was largely political when it was done. I know what the Board of Trustees would do: they'd send it right down here because they're not going to be up there examining pieces of shingle. But who knows?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** That's actually more for the opposite, that if somebody is requesting. We're actually requesting they do a darker ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It's more if someone's requesting an exemption and you don't grant it.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Correct. They would go to appeal.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, they might really want the bright white shingle. Explain what

you're saying.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** No, I don't think so.

**Chairman Cameron:** No, we were lucky because Christina is very [cross-talk] ...

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** She's very sensitive to these types of issues.

**Chairman Cameron:** One of the things Kathy brought up – and I brought a few copies of this for those of you who didn't look it up – is the fact that we are actually in zone four, almost in zone five.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I thought that was interesting. We shouldn't be using reflective roofs.

**Chairman Cameron:** I only have three copies, but as you can see I put a circle on the map. We are at the top of four. By the way, I did not come up with this; this is 100 percent Kathy, I just happened to copy it and print it out. We are almost in five we're so far up in four. Then behind it is the stuff Kathy found on this topic, and I highlighted in yellow the key language which talks about roof surfaces of buildings located in climate zones one through three. We're not in three, so see the one in yellow? That doesn't apply to us, whereas that's what they evidently decided to apply to us.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I think what happened is, when the Green Code was being put together this was the first time people were really focusing on how important it can be to certain areas to have a reflective roof. As energy codes have gotten more sophisticated they've really started looking at the actual climate zones, and said look at areas where heating is predominant: the reflective roofs work at cross purposes to the overall savings over the course of the year. It doesn't say – at some point when climate change would happen and things would heat up – that we wouldn't be part of that. We're on the edge, but the energy codes don't require it.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yeah, we're at four. We'll be 50 years ahead of the climate change.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** But not necessarily doing the right thing for overall energy used over the course of the year, as I understand it.

**Chairman Cameron:** Also we have a bit of a conflict because we, as a town, are situated on steep slopes. Not that we're talking about steep slopes, but you have the visual in front of you of that house with a bright-colored roof, which is not necessarily comfortable at all.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Another very interesting issue is that New York State rejected all the plumbing, all the water conservation, in the Green Code.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Yes.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** So we actually have to go with what the state requires – or actually it's federal, but what's in our state code – and what's in the Green Code. That was never taken out, but it wasn't passed.

**Chairman Cameron:** Right, it wasn't accepted.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** It wasn't accepted by the state. Everything else was, but that wasn't.

**Chairman Cameron:** I think we need to find the best way to diplomatically solve the situation because we may not be so fortunate. In the future, we might have someone come along who really wants a white roof and then we're sort of stuck. This is not technically view preservation, even though the one that really stood out was 400 Warburton. When you stood up there on the Aqueduct trail and looked down in the afternoon you would see this mirror-like effect. Though it wasn't technically blocking your view of the river towards the cliffs, you just sort of have to wear heavy-polarized glasses to see. Hopefully, we can get the Conservation Commission ... maybe they're already considering this.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I think this board can do a recommendation and send it to both the Conservation Commission and the Board of Trustees with this information Kathy has identified about the light-colored roofs. The reflective roofs really are a disadvantage rather than an advantage in this climate. And also the concerns about the steep slopes, looking down on them and the impact they have there. And look at change, that you would recommend changing that provision or taking that out.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** And also the other items that aren't working in the Green Code. Not that there's many, but there are a few.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** On the switch, is that one?

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** The whole house switch? I can't even require it.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Right.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** There's not many. There really isn't many, but there are a couple that need to be addressed. I think if we're going to address one we should sit down with them and address them all.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** That would make a lot of sense to do it once.

E-mail's a terrible thing, but the other comment I made about the natural resources survey – and I agree with Linda when she said it's potentially very valuable on certain size projects – there's certain things, and we've seen them, and only that it's produced when it goes to building permit. It's already been through the board approvals, the Planning and Zoning Board. I think one thing happened when we talked about the cluster law. We actually were reviewing it after the Board of Trustees had their public hearing.

I listened to their conversation on it and they were interested in some of the comments we had. But Linda, I think, pointed out to them we'd have to go ahead and have another public hearing. What we were asking for was basically something like the natural resources survey when it came to that cluster law. It'd be nice to get that in our approval process.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I don't think it actually needs to be put into either the cluster law or any other provision. I think you can require ... and I think, as I said in my e-mail, you're really looking for a good base existing conditions mapping: trees over a certain size, steep slopes, rock outcrops, wetlands.

**Boardmember Bass:** You mean for site plan approval?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Yes.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Yeah, we could definitely add things into the checklist.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I really think that's the best on the larger sites.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Yeah, I think that would just be very helpful.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** On the not already fully developed sites.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** We could actually just put a rider on the existing checklist: projects over, whatever the criteria is, require X, Y, and Z. It's actually very [cross-talk] to do.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I think we were on the same page with what gets required.

By the way, applicants won't have a problem. It's very typical. Certainly if you're looking at something under SEQRA you need that on those larger sites to determine the impacts.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** What would be the size of a site? Is there any guidance on that?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I think it may be a mix of the size of the site and whether it's a developed site or basically undeveloped. If you have a certain size but it's all parking lot and building today, I don't know an existing conditions map with that kind of information is going to do you much good.

**Chairman Cameron:** Or do we want something that says, "and if so requested by the Planning Board" to follow the things?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I mean, you'd like to have it in there because you'd like to get it with the initial submission.

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, that's true.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Certainly under SEQRA and as part of the EAF, some of that information is required on the EAF. I'm just trying to think.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** It sounds like it's something we would like to do.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Yeah. So let's maybe think about ... my brain is [cross-talk].

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** [Unintelligible] which one we were talking about?

**Chairman Cameron:** Right, and then leave an option for us to request it.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Right, it's required for all applications over a certain size property, and the Planning Board has an option to require it on a smaller site.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** The one you were just talking about?

**Boardmember Sullivan:** Oh, the natural resource survey.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** You don't even have to call. I mean, it's a good existing conditions map.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** I'm just making notes.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It serves as a base.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, let's do that top of the next meeting.

**Boardmember Sullivan:** [Rowley] XXX next time. We can call and ask.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I think we can look at especially the undeveloped or under-developed parcels and sort of what the smallest of those are.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Well, I think there are some. There's already some size limitations on where it puts you in the Green Code.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** This isn't really a Green Code thing. This is a more general site plan/subdivision review.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Oh, right. OK.

**Chairman Cameron:** The other thing which we ran into once before, Buddy – and I think you're a volunteer on this – is when we try to do site plan approval, let's say on the Ginsburg Development – I know under the Green Code, and I'm not questioning this – that you guys determine whether these plants are invasive or what have you.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Invasive or non-invasive? We provide them with a list.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yeah, OK. We were getting a little trapped the last time around, whereas we were trying to approve a planning plan without getting any feedback from the Building Department whether there was something that violated Mother Earth in the planning plan. Somehow I think we just do it by procedure.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** And it's two issues. It's not just invasive, it's native.

**Chairman Cameron:** Yes, right.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** You don't want non-native, you want native.

**Chairman Cameron:** So we need somehow, before we approve a planning plan, to have you nod your head or shake your head as to what you want to do on them.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Sure. I could also forward the species list to the Board. I

mean, I have it on my desktop, it's not a big deal.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, I'm going to suggest we take up the Land Use Task Force Report at the next meeting.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** That would make me [cross-talk] a very long week.

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** This is going to be your first chair ...

**Boardmember Sullivan:** I'll be ready for it.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Kathy's first official meeting.

**Chairman Cameron:** Well, it's very interesting listening to this fellow talking about all the things they're doing in the river. Because I spent this morning down at the Hudson River Foundation, which I'm on the board of, and we're doing all sorts of oyster planting up and down the river. We actually put one off Hastings about four years ago.

You probably don't know this, but an oyster bed in Hastings. We actually put a whole bunch underneath the Tappan Zee Bridge, just below the Tappan Zee Bridge. There's a big bed up there.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Whereabouts did you put the bed of oysters?

**Chairman Cameron:** I'm not going to tell you.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** I just asked because there's a ...

**Boardmember O'Reilly:** It's a commercial venture.

**Chairman Cameron:** I'll get the first oysters.

**Building Inspector Minozzi:** Motion to adjourn?

## **VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Next Meeting Date – April 21, 2016**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

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

**Chairman Cameron:** OK, thank you, Kathy. And I'm going to help you Kathy, and everyone else is going to help Kathy.

**Boardmember Bass:** Thank you, Jamie.

**Boardmember Ambrozek:** Yes, we're all going to help you, Kathy.