

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
MAY 21, 2015**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, May 21, 2015 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 Michael Ambrozek, Boardmember Kerry Gould-Schmit, Boardmember William O'Reilly, Boardmember Richard Bass, Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, Deputy Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., and Deputy Village Clerk Mary Ellen Ballantine

Chairman Cameron: Welcome to the Planning Board meeting on Thursday, May 21, 2015. Mary Ellen, could you take the roll call, please?

I. ROLL CALL

Chairman Cameron: Thank you very much. We have a quorum. Could we ask for approval of the minutes?

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of April 16, 2015

Chairman Cameron: Doe anybody have any comments on the minutes of April 16, 2015?

Boardmember O'Reilly: I read them, and I have no comment

Boardmember Bass: No comments.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Actually, on page 23 there's something attributed to me and I don't think I said it. I don't remember commenting on a groundwater system. It's not significant, I just don't recall.

Dep. Village Clerk Ballantine: I'll look at the video.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: OK.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I was not present.

On MOTION of Boardmember Bass, SECONDED by Boardmember O'Reilly with a voice vote of 4 to 0 (Boardmember Ambrozek abstained), the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of April 16, 2015 were approved as amended.

Chairman Cameron: One abstaining and two absent, but we still have a quorum.

III. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Accessory Apartment Permit Renewal – Application of Janet Harris, 51 Summit Drive – SBL: 4.40-30-6 on the Village Tax Maps. Waiver required for parking.**

****Deferred Until June Meeting****

Chairman Cameron: There was an accessory apartment renewal, but that has been put over to the June meeting and deferred till then.

2. **View Preservation and Site Plan Approval – Application of RTB Washington, LLC for the construction of 16 townhouses in three separate clusters, a café and pedestrian mews over a subgrade parking garage at 9-17 Washington Avenue. Said property is located in the MR-C Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.70-48-37 & 38 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairman Cameron: So the first item on our agenda is a view preservation-site plan approval application of RTB Washington. Who's going to do the presentation?

Alexander Cheng, applicant: Can I get this mic, or use this one?

Chairman Cameron: While you're up there why don't you use that one.

Mr. Cheng: Hi. I want to set up the video.

Chairman Cameron: Guys, this really does not work very well because we can't see the audience, they can't see us. You start pointing at things, the pointing doesn't ... just slide it over a little bit. That'd be great.

Mr. Cheng: Does that work? I'm going to put the board up. We prepared some boards to illustrate what are looking to build here. Is the monitor OK?

There are two ... one is video running, which is the model of what we're proposing to build. And there are also a number of boards, numbering from the number one and all the way across. This project came about when I was building a townhouse on Warburton, which is 495. That building, as most of the members know, was in construction for a long time and quite challenging to get built. I love the neighborhood, I've been using these townhouses, and I'd really like to do more. So when I heard about these two properties becoming available, I jumped on the opportunity and tried to improve the neighborhood. The 495 Warburton is actually adjoining this property so I have some ulterior motive to make it better. That's how this project came about.

Because this is a mid-block project and very deep – a pretty sizeable project, a pretty sizeable lot – in the MR-C district, and also on a very steep grade, we came up with an idea we thought would be of interest. We looked around, and we're proposing a mews project which has got a walkway. It's private land, but we're open to the public. There are three rows of townhouses: one to the south fronting Washington Avenue, one to the west and one to the east. As you can see, the one to the right is the one fronting Washington and the one with the green roof is the east row. Then this one is the west row. We looked at the project, comparing it to other developments mostly in the city. We certainly tried to improve upon it and bridge the gap so it's not as dense as what you see in the city, but has still more of the suburban taste to it, a little bit of the sensitivity incorporated in the design. So there are three rows of townhouses with a lot more space than what the city normally will be able to allow us.

The first board shows the aerial view existing, and then what we're proposing. The left corners are some of the mews. In the city, comparable projects, some of them got noted as the beautiful development in the city. So we thought that would be pretty interesting. We looked from all different angles and looked at the existing lot before we were prepping the construction site, and then what happened when the trees were removed. Then we superimposed this picture with our proposed construction, proposed building, and saw what would be the impact. The third board shows the elevation from Washington, which is the south elevation. From Washington Avenue, you can see there are four townhouses. The one to the east has a little café bordering the pedestrian walkway. Because Washington Avenue has such a steep slope, the westernmost building at the bottom actually is the entrance and exit to the underground garage.

So all the houses, other than these houses fronting Washington Avenue, are all built on top of the subterranean building lot. That's how we are able to resolve the parking requirement and try to minimize the parking impact situation on Washington. All these boards have been proposed, or shown, to the neighbors. We have taken the initiative to call for a meeting to invite all the neighbors to view this. This is what we have shown them, basically: the video as well as those cards.

The fourth is the north elevation looking from the commuter lot, the top one. The lower is the western elevation looking at the western row of townhouses. The idea is to have an open space, but also try to maximize the use of the land and still blend in with the neighborhood. You can see that the western houses we limited to below the allowable height. It's about the same height as that fence of the existing Warburton houses. There will be no roof access, only green roofs. So there will be no privacy issue, minimized view kind of impact. So the western houses are only two levels high. They're 16 units, with two affordable.

Chairman Cameron: Don't you mean the eastern houses?

Mr. Cheng: The eastern houses, I'm sorry. There will be two affordable units of various sizes. Some of them are below 1,000 square feet. The two middle ones on Washington are the largest units; they have 2,500 square feet. You have one-bedroom, two-bedroom and three-bedroom of various sizes, various types. The eastern unit has a backyard to give another kind of separation from the eastern units, existing Warburton townhouses. The western houses have a slope down to meet the height requirement. That's the way we were able to interpret it, with the help of the Building Department as well as various sources.

The last three cards are showing the view, again taking a look at the existing lot and then superimposing our proposed construction to see how it's going to show to the people. In our opinion, in summer this view is greatly improved since with are able to remove the tree and rebuild this building. The lot actually has been neglected for a long time. There's a lot of debris in the back, especially at the north end. Once this is constructed, most of that area would basically be cleaned up. Also, the height of this lot we intend to make it a condo bylaw. We try to minimize the entrance, as you can see, the access to the roof. And also we'll try to use the condo bylaw to limit any kind of construction on top of the roof. That's what we're looking to do. The last two actually just show the view of this proposed building versus what we have today. I hope the model is able to illustrate this. We'll actually blend in.

This is a bird's eye view, going to 360 degrees and how it blends in with the neighborhood I think that's basically what I'm prepared to say. Now see if there's any questions.

Chairman Cameron: Any questions?

Boardmember Bass: I do. Going to your condo restriction on the roof construction, would you be willing to put that as a restricted declaration, as a restriction on the deed?

Mr. Cheng: Restricted on?

Boardmember Bass: A property restriction. We do restrictive declarations, don't we?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yeah. If it's going to be a condo and it's recorded in the condominium declaration, then it would have the same effect. It would be like a deed restriction.

Boardmember Bass: OK. I just don't trust condo because those can be amended over time. That's something between the developer and the AG.

Village Attorney Whitehead: We can require as a condition that that provision can't be amended without permission of the Planning Board.

Boardmember Bass: OK. Second, the last time we saw this there was a proposal that the public mews would lead into the parking lot and have some slope down to the parking lot. I didn't see that on the plan, can you speak to that?

Mr. Cheng: Yes. As you can see, this is private land but we want it open to the public. As a resident of this neighborhood, I envision probably get a cup of coffee at the café and then walk through it. There was a set of staircases – I think it's on the place – at the end of the staircase we propose a 4-foot pathway. We're going to have insurance, we will maintain it, and it will be illuminated to an existing, but derelict, staircase – from the existing staircase to the commuter lot. We plan to connect the pathway to it.

This is part of the proposal on the parking floor plan. On the north side you can see there is a sort of little pathway through this graded terrain to connect to existing steps. If you need, we can switch it to show it on the monitor.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Alex, can you put the board on the easel so the Board can see it, please?

Boardmember Bass: Or if you can do it on the monitor.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Or if you can put it up on the screen.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: If you're going to have it on the monitor, Alex, then you can hold it. That's OK.

Mr. Cheng: The plan is, this parking level you're not going to see it because this would be all underground. But on top, you walk through the mews and then go out this way.

Boardmember Bass: So this is kind of a dual question. This is connecting to a public walkway.

Mr. Cheng: This is part of the submission. On the garage level, this is shown. But on the mews level, what happens is you walk in this way and the one level above it, and then it's connected to the staircase at the bottom. This is part of Village land. So we're doing a walkway. There is an existing staircase.

Boardmember Bass: Right. Will you restore that walkway, or that will be the obligation of the Village?

Mr. Cheng: We will build it.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Mr. Cheng: There is no walkway at this point, but there is a number of steps. They're in disrepair.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Obviously, it would be subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees. But that's similar to what's being done right now at 400 Warburton. They're building the walkway and the connection.

Boardmember Bass: And in terms of the obligation for the Village to maintain it, if someone slips on it in the wintertime it's ours.

Village Attorney Whitehead: We could make it theirs.

Mr. Cheng: We have all intentions to maintain it and acquire insurance for the Village.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Just be advised that that not only has to go before the Board of Trustees, that's going to require a state variance. The state says any public-way, any path along a public-way, has to be 10 feet wide. He's only proposing 4. That's a pretty steep state variance that will be very difficult to achieve in its current condition.

Boardmember Bass: The stairs that lead from Warburton through the parking lot down to the train station, what's the width of those stairs?

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I'm not quite sure.

Boardmember Bass: Because I don't think that's 10 feet.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: No, that's not 10 feet.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But they've been there forever.

Boardmember Bass: I know, I know.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: They're preexisting.

Boardmember Bass: I'm trying to find the same hat to put the nail on.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: They'd be at the state's mercy at that point.

Chairman Cameron: When you were here previously, we had discussion about the fact that if you're going to go across town land we need to be in a position where we have a reciprocal right to go across your land. In other words, we don't want to have you – as has happened to us before – shut off our access to your mews while you continue to walk down across town land. So you've come around to that position? Because last time there was some question about that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: About whether the mews would be public.

Mr. Cheng: Yeah, this is our intention. Thomas, if you can show the mews level, this is going to be all open.

Thomas: A little café.

Mr. Cheng: It's all natural to have people getting a cup of coffee, walk through this, and down the staircase.

Boardmember Bass: And that could be an additional restriction on the deed.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, they would have to give an easement to the Village for public access.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Chairman Cameron: Reciprocal easement.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: The design professional that first posed it last time said they wanted, as a secondary means, they may want to put a gate up. That was a major concern with the Board.

Mr. Cheng: I don't think there was any consideration at this point to put a gate up. Certainly we might restrict it in off-hours, but that is something that I guess I'm open to any kind of guidance from the Board.

Boardmember Bass: Do we have any comparable examples of restrictive uses? I know in the city, when there's bonus open space the city does put some time restrictions on it. What do we do?

Village Attorney Whitehead: I don't think it's unreasonable. I don't know if the Village has any public areas on private property that have time restrictions, but I think it might be reasonable to restrict some of the overnight hours just from a safety standpoint.

Mr. Cheng: As a reference, those mews that I've seen – one in Brooklyn, one in Manhattan – they all have time restrictions on them. But I don't know whether we want to put a gate with a time or something like that. Actually, all these townhouses would have access. The front gate is actually sitting on the mews level.

Village Attorney Whitehead: There's obviously times of the day you want to make sure it is accessible to the public.

Boardmember Bass: Right.

Chairman Cameron: We had this discussion on the bridge over the Saw Mill River Parkway in the Ginsburg development. They put the bridge up, and we came to an agreement on that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And actually, on 400 Warburton – which we wouldn't want to do here because the obligation is being put on what's going to be a condominium for maintenance – it was agreed they could close it when there's ice or snow conditions. They

have the option. But you're not going to want to do that here because this is a main walking route, and that isn't.

Boardmember Bass: Not to set anything, but what were your ideas on the time of operation for the café?

Mr. Cheng: This is still very early on.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You keep moving forward.

Mr. Cheng: I would think it would probably start from 7 to 10. I don't know yet.

Boardmember Bass: Again, the reason why I'm asking is, having a destination – eyes on the news and keeping it open for the public – could be coordinated

Boardmember O'Reilly: It would need to be coordinated at both ends. The last thing you'd want to do is climb the steps, walk through there, and find the gate shut and have to come back again.

Boardmember Bass: Right.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yeah, if it's going to be closed it has to be closed at both ends.

Boardmember Bass: I'm doing a kiosk on 57th and 9th Avenue in the park, so I'm kind of aware that the two have to go together.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And you want it to go together with the hours of the café.

Boardmember Bass: OK, I'm done.

Chairman Cameron: OK, anyone else?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I do, a little bit. The eastern units, the backyards, even in the model they're in shade. It's just that's a big concrete wall back there. I think we did discuss this in the past, but if you could talk about it a little bit more because it's sort of very imposing on those units.

Jill Anderson, Baldwin & Franklin Architect: There are some backyards exactly the same in Hastings, which are behind the offices and residences on Warburton where the architects'

offices are. If you go back there, it's exactly the same situation. It's facing the same way, north-south. The wall that's up behind them is almost the same as ours, and there doesn't seem to be a problem about the space at all. So have a look at those and you'll have an example.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: My daughter takes a dance class there. We were just looking at them.

Ms. Anderson: Just go through the little alleyway and you'll see. Because it's facing north-south it's actually surprisingly light. Because you get sunlight.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: All right, I will take a look. Just because it does seem ...

Ms. Anderson: Yeah, I suddenly came across it when I was going to Joe Locascio's office. I realized, oh, this is exactly the same dimension.

Mr. Cheng: And actually, the one mews in Brooklyn is rated as one of the most beautiful buildings in the neighborhood in New York. It actually has a back door just like this. So it is working pretty well over there. And we do have an intention of making that wall green.

Boardmember Bass: Jamie, I actually have one more question. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to monopolize this. The two variances that are being requested are for lot coverage and for an undersized parking space. Can you speak to how you couldn't manipulate the site plan to eliminate that? Would the loss of one unit be prohibitive in order to achieve the removal of those variance requests?

Mr. Cheng: I guess the interpretation is, actually, all the mews is considered coverage space even though they are paved, with greenery of trees and shrubs. That's the reason we kind of got into, I guess, requesting a variance. Because the only part is in this part and the little setback over there. And also because of the height limitation, we try to be sensible and considerate when we build those buildings. There's really not a whole lot of marketable space we can use.

So, yes, there is some financial consideration. I'm not a typical developer, as you can probably see. I do have incentives to beautify this neighborhood since I'm going to be bordering it. But it's not a profitable proposition here, and we don't have a lot of, I guess, leeway to cut back on things.

Ms. Anderson: The coverage is for the parking. So in order to get enough parking spaces, we have to make it as big as possible. The Board and the Building Department have decided that underground parking is the structure which is counted, not the above-ground.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Ms. Anderson: So that's our dilemma.

Boardmember Ambrozek: And could you address the need for the reduced size of the one parking space?

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It's actually two parking spaces. If you look at my e-mail dated May 5, it's two parking spaces that are going to require variances. Their zoning table had some errors. If you notice on that e-mail, there's also two other variances that they didn't mention that are most likely going to be required, as well.

Boardmember Bass: Can you tell me what they are?

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Absolutely. First, on the parking spaces, spot number six is only 8 by 18 and the minimum required is 9 by 18. Then there's spot number 17, which is only 10 by 10 and they're calling out for a super compact or a smart car.

The other two variances would be, according to 295-20(g), the side yard in relation to length. They're saying it's proposed zero, required zero. I read it as required 7, proposed zero.

The last one would be 295-21(c), the width of a court in relation to height. The requirement's 30, proposed is 16. On their original application to me, they didn't feel this was considered a court. But in my interpretation of the code I believe it is a court. So I believe that variance will also stand.

Ms. Anderson: This is the first time I've heard Buddy mention these particular cases. When we talked to Buddy and Deven before, it was viewed that an MR-C district had a zero setback and that would be continued. That was Deven's opinion.

Then in the question of the court, a court is defined as enclosed on three sides. In this case, they are not enclosed on three sides and that's why we didn't think that was required.

Boardmember O'Reilly: How can you control someone having a smart car? I mean, everybody these days buys the larger vehicles. Are you going to say that a resident must have a smart car in terms of occupancy?

Ms. Anderson: No, it's just that the Village requirements for parking are very stringent and quite large in comparison with other communities. The direct neighbor actually runs parking lots all over the country, and he said there would never be a case of people requiring that number of parking spaces for this kind of residence. Small square footage houses usually only have one car. So in all probability, there will be a lot of spare parking spaces in terms of the actual residences, these houses.

Chairman Cameron: I see you struggled a bit with our lovely way in which you calculate the height of buildings in this district.

Ms. Anderson: Oh, this was very complicated. Deven and Buddy helped us do this, and that is apparently the way to do it on a slope with a deep ... if you want me to explain it, it took me ...

Chairman Cameron: No, I know what you did.

Ms. Anderson: Oh, good, good.

Chairman Cameron: I actually drafted the provision.

Ms. Anderson: Good. So, Jamie, you understand. It took me a great deal of time to work it out.

Chairman Cameron: I didn't say I understood, I said I drafted it. But what I'd like to have from you, if I could, is a contour map of the property – I'm sure you have one – because I want to make sure that you worked on the contour of the land. And that's the contour of the land before you build a garage.

Ms. Anderson: No, I think that's what we took from the survey. And that drawing on drawing nine shows the contours. That's what I did it from.

Mr. Cheng: And I think that's certified by the surveyor. We actually asked the surveyor back several times, and that's how we got that.

Ms. Anderson: On nine, it shows the contours underneath.

Chairman Cameron: Could you give us a larger version of this map? Because it's a little hard to read. If you could just blow it up and give it to us I'd appreciate it.

Ms. Anderson: Sure.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: When this application came in, I questioned the height. Their assistant came down to the office and we did go over it step by step. It appeared to be that it was within the regulation of the code.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I think in some parts the plan of the change in zoning didn't come about from this. Because the buildings are stepping down as you come to the north. I'm just not sure whether the western buildings are low enough, and that's another issue.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: That's the exact thing I questioned myself.

Chairman Cameron: We've got to look at that rather carefully. I think it's an important issue. And it's the other elephant in the room, which is view preservation.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Of course.

Chairman Cameron: Which we haven't discussed yet, which I will. Does anybody else on the Board have a question, leaving aside view preservation for a moment?

OK, anybody in the audience have a comment they'd like to make? Please, come up.

Victoria Bugby, 35 Washington Avenue: I live four doors up from this property. I do feel like our neighborhood is being a small shoe that they are trying shoehorn many buildings in. I think 29 cars, 16 units is way too big for our neighborhood. Also, Washington Avenue has a real problem with the cars. I mean, sometimes I can't even get down Washington Avenue because the Broadway training center is there, people come up from the train. To have 29 cars coming in and out, it's impossible. You also are talking about building another building, properties and townhouses, where the old convent is. That's four more places. So immediately you're putting probably, I'd say, 70 people into our neighborhood.

It's too big. I will stand my ground and get people to say it's too big. I've collected 50 signatures on the convent, and I can collect many more on this. So please consider that. I think Jill and Ned do beautiful buildings, I love their work. It's just too big.

Chairman Cameron: Anybody else in the audience like to comment? Yes, please.

Jo Andrews, 493 Warburton Avenue: I was just wondering, what is the building in Brooklyn that you're referring to?

Mr. Cheng: That's called Warren Mews.

Ms. Andrews: OK. I'd just love to look it up because it's interesting.

Mr. Cheng: Over here there are a few. There's Warren Mews in Brooklyn and there's Washington Mews just north of NYU. Again, there's several other comparable.

Ms. Andrews: All right, sorry. Thanks. I'll look it up, thank you.

Also, I'm really concerned about the height of the western units. I don't really know what the code is. If someone could explain it to me that would be great. But I just feel like the privacy is being compromised. And had I known, behind the building that that was going to happen I think we wouldn't have made that decision. You know, it's kind of concerning, as much as I'm for the development of the town, obviously.

The other thing I'm concerned about is, having lived in our building for a couple of years, all the traffic going over the bridge. The buildings actually shake. So I'm just wondering what steps are taken – and I'm sure you've all done this – on the stability of the underground parking, and then how is everything reinforced. I don't really need a technical explanation, but I just wanted to flag that.

Chairman Cameron: I would like to read a letter into the record, if I could. This was a letter we received from a woman who lives at 491 Warburton, which is the second house over, Beth Rudd.

She wrote:

"Dear members of the Board,

Unfortunately, I doubt I'll be able to attend the meeting on Thursday, May 21 regarding the proposed project at 9-17 Washington Avenue. My son, David, is getting married Saturday and I'll have a full house and a very full next few days. It's all very exciting.

I write to let you know that I am neither adverse to change, nor automatically oppose any development in any way. However, I am indeed opposed to the size and scope of the project, which would deprive us not only of our views and our privacy, but of the entire character of the beautiful townhouse which has been our home for 10 years. In November 2004, after weeks of studying the plans online, I finally got

to see my future home. Yes, the floors and doors and hardware were beautiful, at the entry level all the finishes were lovely, thanks to the artistry of Ned Baldwin and Jill Anderson.

But walking up the stairs to the main living room was nothing less than thrilling, and it still is every time for everyone who comes in. When you come in the stairs after entering the dark foyer of the house, it's not until about three steps from the top that the spectacular, expansive view is suddenly, dramatically revealed. It was, and is, breathtaking no matter the season or time of day. This is the wow factor of the place. The back of the house, to my continued delight, feels like a beach house in contrast with the front, which is more like a city brownstone. Twelve feet of windows overlooking the river and the Palisades, keyed in a bit during summer for total privacy on the deck but completely unobstructed for more than half the year when the leaves are down.

Well, we already lost our privacy since all the trees were removed from the property at 9-17 last summer. So that chapter is already over wherein the months when we wanted to be outside we were protected by a screen of green. And now they want to take the view, what we looked forward to all year but particularly in fall and winter, in the main living area at the back of the house. There's no question whatsoever that were this project to go through as proposed my house would completely lose its personality. Our spectacular relationship with the river and the Palisades would be over.

I think that even Mr. Cheng, after spending a lot of time at my house last Friday, would have to admit that in its present incarnation this development would cut our view in half, leaving only a thin sliver of river where now we see the base of the water tower and the river shoreline which gives dimension and character to the whole scene. Sitting at our dining room table, we see buildings. Coming up these stairs, instead of that thrilling first glance we see buildings. In addition, it is clear that the results of the stifling proximity of the proposed units, and the looming heights of the southern and western rows especially, would be catastrophic at best, and suffocating at worst.

Now we have open expanse, beach house expanse. Clearly, the feeling we have in our house, the experience of being in our house and on our deck, would never be the same. This special feeling is why I bought the house. It would most certainly be taken away forever.

I have nothing against development and nothing against Mr. Cheng, who is a businessman with his own interests. For him to continue to insist that he has to build all 16, and that the southern and western houses have to remain at their present proposed heights in order for him to make good on his investment, is not my concern, nor should it be the Village's concern. My house is my only investment, and I worked hard to get it. I am the single mother of four children and have managed to raise them on my teacher's salary, with no child support, for 10 years. The house is all I have and all I'll probably leave to my kids. I am sure you can understand the depth of my feeling about the project, which is a major threat to the quality of our lives now and to the value of my house in the future.

I don't want to speak to my neighbors. The sides and the backs of the houses are interesting, aesthetically designed. It's fairly obvious that the real selling point was the special view. Mr. Cheng talks about compromises we must all make. Our privacy is gone, our view is threatened, we're looking at serious traffic congestion issues, not to mention years of construction on a very small site right smack in front of our faces. Please tell me where the compromise is, exactly. It's too many, too high, and on too small a site.

Thank you for your consideration, and anyone who'd like to visit me in my house is more than welcome. You'll love the view, especially when you first come up the stairs."

Sincerely,

*Beth Rudd
491-A, Warburton Avenue*

Chairman Cameron: She's obviously a good writer. Great teacher.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Well, I took Mrs. Rudd up on her offer this afternoon and went around and looked at the ... stood on the deck, looking across. But I was trying to imagine the height of these buildings, and I am concerned about the height of the western building. There's no way, as far as I can see, that it's not going to have a definite impact the way she describes on those people who have been accustomed to having a view such as they have enjoyed. Which raised, in my mind, the question of the economic impact on those owners. Because being in real estate myself, I went back to the office and looked up the listing for the last property to sell in 491. It actually was described very nicely. The pictures taken at that time, back in 2013, showed a definite view of the river and the Palisades very clearly, taken

from the patio level. And then I guess they took others from the upper level, which were unobstructed views of the river.

It's definite those views will change, and I think there is a view preservation issue here, very much, apart from the fact that in the listing the first remarks about the property are "*highlighted by expansive Hudson River views,*" and then it's repeated later, "*year 'round river view.*" Which is what has sold those properties. So I can see why she's concerned and I can see why it does present an issue. So the question is how to convince us that those western buildings are not going to do what these homeowners believe it's going to do.

Boardmember Bass: Well, before ... this is a question I would like to have a discussion with the Board. In my reading, the view preservation ordinance is not that I moved in here 10 years ago and nothing between me and the river can ever be built. That's not how I read the view preservation ordinance.

Boardmember O'Reilly: No, I'm not saying that either.

Boardmember Bass: I feel for her, and there are concerns about views. But it's not I'm here and therefore nothing between me and the river can ever block my views. If you're that concerned about the views you should buy property on the river. The view preservation ordinance, as I read it, is – and, again, I'm looking for direction because I have never reviewed one since I've been on the Board – what is the intent? Is it for this board to take into consideration those concerns? I don't view it as prohibition.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Well, I'm not raising it as a prohibition. From my point of view, though, we had – I think in the code – the least obstruction possible. We had that issue come up in a house recently where there was a concern about losing their view. We approved what the neighbor wanted to do because it was not seriously impacting. It didn't mean that it couldn't be done, but where it may have an impact. And where it may have an economic impact, I think we owe – from my point of view – some consideration as to what needs to be done in order to alleviate some of that ... just alleviate some of that, I'll leave it at that.

Ms. Andrews: Can I just quickly speak about that? When we bought, we were very concerned about the view. You know, the view is it. So I asked that question a number of times, and I was reassured that Hastings' Board did not ... was very strict with view preservation. And if you bought a house with a view it was never going to be obstructed.

Boardmember Bass: That was by a broker.

Ms. Andrews: Right, and I loved our broker.

Boardmember Bass: You got that in writing, and your attorney reviewed it.

Ms. Andrews: Yeah. I mean, maybe we should have done our due diligence. It's just concerning when you bought a house and you face that the property value could go down, obviously that's very concerning. And that's all I've got to say.

Boardmember Bass: I'm not being flippant.

Ms. Andrews: Yeah.

Boardmember Bass: I really understand. And it's a balancing act between property rights – your property rights, his property rights ...

Ms. Andrews: Totally.

Boardmember Bass: ... the intent of the preservation ordinance, how it can be mitigated so that you have a win-win or less of a lose-lose. That's how I view it, and that's what I'm trying to wrestle with. But I do this type of development, and I have lots of people when I worked in government complaining about their views of the Hudson River when Riverside South was being blocked. They were on the second floor and had an unobstructed view of the Hudson River for years. That's not the same case as you, but what's the balance? How does this board balance it?

Ms. Andrews: Yeah, I think that's the discussion.

Mr. Cheng: Maybe I could respond to some of the concern here. We actually have shown the picture. This is the summer view. When the leaves are in – actually for even my house, for 495 – we like to be in the woods. Actually, people say this is almost like living in a treehouse. A big part of it, actually, we're boxed in by trees. This is the existing view in summertime and this is what is removed, and this is what we're proposing with the new construction.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Can you put those up on the screen?

Chairman Cameron: I think one thing we need to do is, we're going to obviously visit these locations. And also, we need to get a better feel what floor these pictures were taken from. Because if you look at the pictures I saw, which Bill showed me from the advertisement for the property, it's beyond spectacular. Now, it was probably taken from the roof, but we have to go and look at various places and see what's what.

Just to continue on what Richard was saying, it is a balancing. We can't take someone's property rights from them by not allowing them to build anything. On the other hand, we can work with them on trying to make whatever they want to do have a lesser impact on the people behind. So it's a balancing act. That's why you have your fellow citizens up here rather than interested parties.

Go ahead.

Mr. Cheng: Yes. This is taken from the balcony level. As far as we can discern ...

Boardmember Bass: Can you just ... because the audience is not seeing this, when you describe "it" just read the label of what picture you're pointing at.

Mr. Cheng: Yeah. This one is "site before tree removal, looking west from that level, of Warburton houses." So we're looking to do so a panoramic view. I think this is from Beth Rudd's balcony, on the balcony level. This one is looking at Beth Rudd's bedroom level, which is third floor. You can see this is a picture if you open up ... actually there are a lot of branches.

Chairman Cameron: If you could point your pointer at the particular picture so you can see.

Village Attorney Whitehead: He's pointing on the paper.

Mr. Cheng: This one is left-most ...

Chairman Cameron: Top left, left-most. Can you see the site before tree removal, the left upper level? You touched on it. That's the deck in summertime. When the tree was removed, this becomes the view. Certainly, it's a little bit disingenuous in this picture because when we were removing the tree, prepping the land, Beth and her husband came down and thanked me for it. Because they've been saying they had been dreaming about being able to remove this tree.

When this is done, we're looking to propose a building ... actually, this would become a comparable view in summertime. So, yes, they will be able to see Palisades, they will be able to see the Hudson River, in summertime. So clearly, in summertime is a big plus. And in winter view – because it's hard to play with it – this is going through a lot of branches. This is one over to the right. This is the only picture we have, and we're still asking around, including Beth, to supply us with pictures. Actually, this photo, as far as we can tell – it was

supplied by Michael, Beth's husband – this is taken from the third floor, from the bedroom. It's hard to zoom up, but going through the branches you could see Palisades, you could see the river, but it's not obstructed.

There are existing buildings. The proposed building is not going to be taller than the existing building at the corner of Washington and Southside, and certainly much lower than on the opposite end. This becomes the roofline, as you can see, from the balcony level. There will be some compromise, there will be some obstruction of the river, but not the Palisades. So we figure this is a give and take, and we are putting all the due consideration in. I'm impacted myself as a resident of one of the townhouses. Those are the pictures we have done with this model which reflected the height of the proposal.

Boardmember Bass: What's the floor to ceiling height on the parking level? And can that site be excavated down so the whole structure goes further down into the ground so it reduces the height? That's not a very articulate way of saying it, but you know what I mean.

Ms. Anderson: We started street level at the lowest side of Washington, and then go down. It is possible if we have a slope in the parking lot so it's not level ... it's possible to go further down as the hill goes down. Yes, that is true.

Boardmember Bass: Could you, for our next meeting, look at that as an option, as a way of reducing height, even if it's a few feet? I know that's an additional expense for the excavation and maneuvering in the garage, but that could be helpful.

Ms. Anderson: Can you address the owner of the property?

Boardmember Bass: I was looking at him, too.

Mr. Cheng: Yeah, I hear that. That was one of the considerations, actually, we have looked into. The mews level is already at grade; it's low and going sort of downhill. One of the concerns is, if we do more then there would be steps going into the building. None of these buildings actually have high ceilings. Actually, the most is 8 feet – so it's not extravagant – in order to maintain this height.

Boardmember Bass: It's floor to slab or floor to ceiling?

Ms. Anderson: Proposed ceiling.

Mr. Cheng: Then, as you can see, we imposed this on ourselves to remove one floor on the eastern unit.

Ms. Anderson: That was in the houses, not the parking lot.

Boardmember Bass: All right.

Chairman Cameron: Actually, the height at the outside of the place is 88 feet. It goes up 8 inches inside the ramp, and then the ramp falls a foot 8 inches after that. So the total fall is only 1 foot over the entire ramp, and still you can look at falling more than 1 foot.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Which is only required: 3 percent, by code, is 30 feet from the center line of the traveled way. They'd have to watch their pitch, so we'd be creating another variance there.

Ms. Bugby: I have one question, if I can ask you. I'm concerned about the fact that they've taken out all the trees, they've taken out all the grass. If you put in all these people, what's going to clean your air? It's a big environmental block of buildings. I know there's some planting, but what's the coverage over the parking lot? Is that pavement and then a few trees here and there? So, again, that's my concern: too big, and it's taking away greenspace.

Mr. Cheng: Well, I have first-hand knowledge of the lot, actually. When the trees are all in like this you don't get to see it. Actually, they were not really taken care of over the years. The tenants of this building have been there for over 50 years. They're all renters. There is a lot of debris. Actually, personally, I removed over a dozen milk cartons. They just toss it, and there's a lot of debris in this place and it's covered up.

So yeah, we do have every intention to make this a beautiful place. And we're going to plant trees, and I think the people who come into this place will try to make it as nice as possible. We would certainly get started on that. Also, not to deviate from our discussion at this point, we have shown all this to the neighbors. Sorry, not everyone showed up. We rented a place in the Community Center and went through, basically, show and tell. There was a lot of concern with traffic. We understand a lot of residents, or neighbors, are interested in solving the problem of lower Washington. We say this is really beyond our ability to address, but most of the neighbors are interested and we will participate in coming up with some options and going through the Safety Council to address those.

But the initial reading is, if we abide by the traffic flow, then the police chief thinks it's OK. Again, there's no guarantee, but we think because of its location – and because one of the major attractions of this is being so close to the train station – probably it will not have the typical suburban setup of a family with three cars. I would think it would probably be less than that.

Boardmember Bass: Will the parking spaces be tied to the units as they're sold, or is the parking sold separately?

Mr. Cheng: That's what we're considering at this point.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I have a question. With your plans, especially the elevations on sheet 8, you don't give the individual elevations for each floor, which made it difficult for me to try to do any calculations of the height to the slope of the land. That would be very useful information to have.

And you have a fairly thick layer underneath the mews that you build up between the mews and the roof of the garage. I'm wondering whether that could be reduced in this, as well.

Ms. Anderson: That's the layer where all the electrical, gas, all the amenities to all the houses go. At the moment, maybe it could be reduced slightly, but not much. Because you have to have, you know, the sewers, and all those things are on a slope.

I didn't quite understand your question about the elevations.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, you only show the base level and the upper roof levels, but there's no floor-to-ceiling measurements shown on sheet 8, for example ...

Ms. Anderson: So you just needed all the ...

Boardmember Ambrozek: ... for each floor.

Ms. Anderson: OK, OK.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I'm sorry if I didn't hear, but how many units exist in the buildings that you bought?

Mr. Cheng: Right now, one building has four units and one building's got two units, and no parking.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And no parking. So it is all on the street.

Mr. Cheng: Right.

Boardmember Bass: So it's an increase of 10 units and off-street parking.

Again, this is a question to the Board. Has Hastings ever considered permit parking for residents as a way of controlling parking? Did I just step on a landmine?

Village Attorney Whitehead: You mean on the streets?

Boardmember Bass: Yeah.

Chairman Cameron: There's a problem.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It requires home rule legislation. The Board of Trustees has talked about it, but the state legislature has to grant you home rule authority to do it.

Boardmember Bass: OK. Just from other discussions I've heard, Washington Street has an issue with commuters.

Village Attorney Whitehead: There's been some discussion about it because of the issue of commuters taking up parking.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Chairman Cameron: It's considered quite difficult to get the legislature ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: To get anything done in the state legislature.

Chairman Cameron: See, one of our problems is to get the tenants in the building to use their parking spaces rather than parking on the street. We have that problem all the time.

Boardmember Bass: If the mews was successful in terms of a development we could create a parking program where people who live in that area could have a reserved parking spot in the parking lot in the evenings, when it's underutilized, for a small fee.

Chairman Cameron: A public parking garage. Somebody brought up the dangers of Washington Avenue. And since you don't have the footnotes, which we do, I might mention to you that the Police Chief has said that they should exit from the underground garage always going to the right, and coming down the hill they should also come in from the right. They can't come up the hill and turn left because of the narrowness of the street. That was his suggestion.

Ms. Anderson: I believe that's shown on the ...

Chairman Cameron: It's in the footnotes.

Ms. Anderson: Yeah, and it's on the plan, I believe.

Chairman Cameron: Yes, these big arrows. You notice the big arrows, I'm looking for the fine print. So I guess one of the things we're going to need to do, as a planning board, is to go and visit one or more tenants, or one or more people, living in these things and take a look at their views. I was actually in your backyard today, and I didn't see ... at one time you had a flagpole up there with a ball on it. It'd be very useful if we could somehow get some sort of markers there, where we as Planning Board members can – and also the people who are living in them can – actually not just imagine what portion of the view is being blocked, but could also actually physically see them.

Arthur Riolo, 32 Main Street: I'd like to respond to that. At Beth Rudd's request we took the flag down.

Chairman Cameron: Oh, you did. OK. At some point we'd like to put it back up for a temporary period.

Mr. Riolo: We'd be happy to do it. She was complaining that she was looking at a red flag and it was bothering her so we said we'll take it down.

Chairman Cameron: OK, so we will. But we'll let you know when we'd like you to put it back up, and we'll talk to her first.

Mr. Cheng: We have the model constructed right now. It cost some money, some investment, but it will be available if the Board is willing to use it. Because that's actually the exact height of the proposed construction. That would help also, and the model will actually show that. We're trying to understand her and trying to work with her.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I think it'd be helpful for us. Because nothing's better for understanding a person's concern than actually being able to stand where they're standing where they see what they think they've lost.

Boardmember Bass: Some visual mockup would be really helpful.

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, but you have something there to give us a marker. I think that's important.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So when you go visit, you can see where the roof is going to be.

Boardmember Bass: Great suggestion.

Chairman Cameron: Now the other thing we'd like to have before you next come before us is to have you fill out ... we have a block where you can put the zoning table, how you meet all the variances and meet all the setback requirements. While I threatened Ned last time that we wouldn't take the papers unless they appeared, we took them anyway. But for the next meeting we want to have the zoning table which shows that you're meeting all the requirements in the heights, side lines and those things. And Buddy can certainly ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: In a table format that's easy to reference.

Chairman Cameron: And Buddy knows exactly what it's like because he's a pro at making sure you fill it out. So go and see him. Because otherwise, we have a hard time understanding this and it's hard for us to exchange ideas. As you know, because of the public meeting laws we can't have more than three of us in one room at one time and we're not supposed to e-mail back and forth.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: And there was a mistake on the form, too. Linda?

Village Attorney Whitehead: In the EAF, in part one, question number two, it says, "*Does the proposed action require a permit approval or funding from any other governmental agency?*" That should be yes, and the Zoning Board of Appeals should be listed there. That's intended, under SEQRA, to tell the Board if there are any other involved agencies for purposes of SEQRA review. So the Zoning Board is another governmental agency. You should just review and see if there's any other agencies that you might need approvals from. Because this board is going to – and we'll probably do it when you come back the next time – start the SEQRA process and circulate this. So we need to know what other governmental agencies you will need approvals from.

Boardmember Ambrozek: While looking at that item – the next item, number three – the total coverage is actually 0.05 acres more than the land owned by them. I believe that you're referring to the Village property as being that 0.05-acre additional. This is item 3-C, for the walkway.

Mr. Cheng: Which one?

Boardmember Ambrozek: On the short Environmental Assessment Form.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Per 1, question 3, you've got total acreage of the site, and then you've got total acreage to be physically disturbed. And those are the same, indicating that the entire site is going to be disturbed.

Ms. Anderson: Unfortunately, Ned Baldwin couldn't be here tonight. He filled this in, and it must be that. I don't know how else it could be more than the acreage. But I will check that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: If you could have him please review that.

Mr. Cheng: I don't think that refers to any part of the Village land.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Could be his adjacent land that he owns.

Boardmember Ambrozek: It's just very unusual to see a number there that is larger than the actual physical property that you're developing.

Mr. Cheng: We'll look into it. I think it's probably just a simple mistake. We're not referring to the Village land or we'd have to ask for an easement.

Boardmember Ambrozek: While we're talking about this, on item number 9, which says, "*Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements,*" there's a comment, "*If the proposed action will exceed requirements, please describe the design features and technologies.*" You do tick that it will meet or exceed the code requirements. My hope is that you do exceed the code requirements, so it would be very useful if you described how you exceed the code requirements.

Mr. Cheng: We'll look into it.

Boardmember Ambrozek: That's good, yes. Then in item 17, you say that there will be "*no stormwater discharge to adjacent properties.*" But you say that "*no stormwater discharge will be directed to established conveyance systems.*" So if it's not being directed to any established conveyance systems, where is the stormwater being contained?

Mr. Cheng: In the plan, actually, there is a preliminary; it's not complete or spelled out. We did consult an engineer and there is a rainwater storage tank under the parking lot. Basically, the intent is once it's calculated it would be a storage tank, and then it would be seeping through the ground.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just infiltration?

Mr. Cheng: Infiltration, yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Has there been any soil testing done?

Mr. Cheng: We feel pretty comfortable with this land because the construction of Warburton Townhouses – from 491 to 493, and also 495 – this is all infill land.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just so you know, the Planning Board is going to retain an engineer who is going to review the stormwater management. It's obviously something that's of great concern. So the planning Board will retain an engineer at your expense, and they will be reviewing the stormwater plan.

Ms. Anderson: There is reference on drawing 9, number 4 about the storm retention.

Boardmember Bass: Could you blow that up?

Chairman Cameron: Jill, I'd like proper measurements. I'd like building heights, building widths. You've got these sketches and you've got these lines, but it's pretty hard to figure out how high a building is when you're looking at it. You have to do a calculation to do it, and normally they have a building height to the edge of the building and from the existing grade. Then we can really understand this a lot better.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Did you look at Kathy's building height calculation?

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I have it here.

Chairman Cameron: One of the issues – and we've got to look at it when we get the contour lines – is that I think Kathy did that by having the 35-foot wide zones going perpendicular to the buildings rather than going perpendicular to the curb.

Boardmember O'Reilly: To the street.

Chairman Cameron: The curb. And then they did the curb, which actually produced more of an angle than I thought it would. But we'll have to take a look at it more closely. And just lines going this way may not have put them quite as much height as they otherwise would.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Buddy is going to have to take another look at the height issue with Kathy's information.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Because her calculations put the building too high.

Chairman Cameron: That's because she did the lines parallel to the back wall.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Oh, OK.

Chairman Cameron: I think that's how she did it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: In the code.

Chairman Cameron: They did it that way, and then you can see she did it the other way. We're going to have a little discussion about this.

Boardmember O'Reilly: It will come up.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The height issue is not going away because of the view preservation.

Chairman Cameron: Anything else? So we will you soon.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And Buddy will be contacting you. We are going to have to set up an escrow account to pay for the engineer and consultants working on the project.

Mr. Cheng: There is, I guess, an issue. As you can see, actually this plan has been in the works for quite some time. It's almost a year now since I acquired this property. It's been going on, and we tried to do the model and tried to adjust the plan and finalize it. So it has been quite some time. I think a procedural matter is we will have to seek an easement from the Board of Trustees. I hope the Board will give me some guidance as to what the procedure is to go in front of the Board of Trustees.

Chairman Cameron: We actually had this discussion the last time you were here, and you guys were concerned that you couldn't build it at all unless you had a second exit off the property in the back. At that time, I think we suggested to you that you go to the Trustees and get an emergency second exit – not an as-of-day use, but an emergency exit – and thus solve your legal problem on having to have two exits off the property. Evidently you haven't done that, but that's all ready.

I think one of the difficulties of going now for the easement you want to have is, the Board of Trustees is undoubtedly going to turn around to us and say. "Are you satisfied with the

design, does it work? We're not going to give these people an easement unless you're happy with it." So maybe we'll have to talk to some of the members on the Board and see how we do that, but that's what they're going to ask us. We still need complete documentation from you, and the more you do that and give that to us early the better we can work on this and the quicker we can move forward. But that's a real issue because we can't do this on sketches. We actually need drawings and we need the information I mentioned earlier and, undoubtedly, some other issues are going to come up. And we need to go and visit these places and look at the view.

Boardmember Ambrozek: And I think Buddy also pointed out that any easement for the pathway for the other exit also has to be from New York State.

Village Attorney Whitehead: On state code variance for the width of the walkway.

Chairman Cameron: Well, thank you very much and look forward to seeing you sometime soon.

Mr. Cheng: If the Boardmembers need any of this information just let us know.

Chairman Cameron: Sure. If you would just take these boards, or copies of these boards, and give them to our Building Inspector he would then have them available for us to come and look at them from time to time. I don't want to clutter up his offices, but that would probably be a good way of doing it.

Mr. Cheng: OK, thank you.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you very much. Thank you for the comments from everybody.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: If you want, you can leave them downstairs by the door and I'll put them inside tonight.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - None

V. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

View Preservation and Site Plan Approval – Application of CCI Properties LLC for the construction of an additional building containing five

townhouse units on its property at 32-34 Washington Avenue. Said property is located in the MR-1.5 zoning district and is known as SBL: 4.70-53-11 on the Village Tax Maps.

Chairman Cameron: Now we move to the next item on our agenda, which is under old public hearings. If they're not going to use it, maybe we can move this. Everyone move to the right. The new requirements with the screen is, you come in with two architects every time. Just kidding. Ahh, more drawings. I heard rumors of this. You need the microphone.

Christina Griffin, project architect: I've been before the Zoning Board, but just for a preliminary review. No decisions were made because we happen to have our notices out for that. Now we've come back to you to respond to some of your comments. I actually have some drawings I wanted to hand out because since we submitted the drawings to you, we've done some more work on trying to see how we can respond to things like impact on view and driveway layouts. I just want to pass this down. This is slightly different than what we gave your originally, and there's also a summary of the changes that we made.

Village Attorney Whitehead: If you could show us the changes going forward back to the last Planning Board slot.

Ms. Griffin: This is our current site plan. What we've done since we last saw you, we had a new survey made – the survey was updated – because we found some inconsistencies on the southern side of the property on this end. Those inconsistencies were here, and we just simply had the survey updated and resolved all those things. We put in the wall that is here; there's actually two walls, a very high wall and a low wall. Kathy had noticed that so we made those changes. We also submitted the EIS statement that now is complete, and responded to the comments by Kathy.

The footprint of the building's been reduced slightly. What we did is reduce the length of this building by 2 feet. We also moved back the porch so we would have a setback. Instead of 15.75 we have 19.3 feet. That is simply because we're trying to get some more space for the trees. We also have an arborist who's doing a study of the trees. He's gone out and tagged them, looking at which ones we might want to take down. Some of them are very crowded, some unhealthy. We're going to be getting a letter from him to find out if this seems to be a comfortable distance between the trees and the building.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Can I ask a question? Are the trees that are tagged the ones to stay or the ones that are coming down? Because I saw a couple today.

Chairman Cameron: The dead ones were tagged.

Ms. Griffin: Yeah, I think so.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I guess I can't tell a good one from a dead one.

Ms. Griffin: We've also changed the height of the building, which I will show you on the elevations. We reduced the height by 2 feet. We changed the roof configuration and went with a 4 in 12 roof slope instead of the 5 in 12 that we had before. The stair from Warburton Avenue going to the building, that central stair, was eliminated. We now have steps from a common walk going down to an entry into the garage. This is so we would discourage people from parking on Warburton Avenue. They would have to go into the garage and then up through these steps to the main walk to get them into their units, or walk along the sidewalk that's next to the driveway.

We've shown the waste areas, and I'm going to show you on the basement plan how that works. What we decided to do is to make sure people can take their waste areas – which would be under the porches, these porches are high enough so waste can fit – and bring it down the common walk. There'll be a common area that they can put their garbage when it's time for a pickup. We put a lot of thought into that because we've done projects where they had shared dumpsters, and sometimes they're not kept very tidy. So we thought each person should be able to bring their garbage down to this little paved area on the sidewalk. We might enclose that with a fence and maybe some shrubbery so we can conceal the waste area.

We reduced the size of the dormers, and I'll show you that in the elevations.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Christina, you got to talk into the mic.

Ms. Griffin: We changed the dormers to give it a little more variety and just reduce the size of them. The driveway at the two-family house has completely changed because we looked very carefully at how we can make this a better layout; how you can make it safe so these residents can actually turn around before they come out. Because right now, they have to back out into Washington street. That was our goal from the beginning. So we moved the turnaround to the back of the house. Now they can come and turn around here and come out. We are still going to cut the opening in the wall just so we can improve the sight lines.

We eliminated the variance for the setback. We've kept the 5-foot minimum setback to the parking here, and we also eliminated the variance for having too much width on the curbcuts. The maximum width of the curbcuts is 24 feet; this one is 10, which is existing; and this one is 12. That adds up to 22 feet.

The details of the drawing I'll show you in a minute. The engineers did a blowup of each driveway to show sight lines and turnaround space. The garage layout, I'm going to show you another slide. We've changed the layout so we can show compliance with the Hastings zoning code. I think you heard earlier tonight that ... you know, I think our zoning code requires a lot of space for parking spaces – like 9 feet wide. I started out with 8 foot 6, and we just found a very clever way to change that so each space meets the code at 9 by 18 minimum with a 24-foot turnaround.

We also have a view analysis that is actually based on going into the buildings nearby. We went into the first and second floor of 15 William Street, which is the building up over here. And we also took a few more pictures from this house, just directly across from the buildings.

Now, there are other questions we have on the list here and we're still working on some of these items. I mentioned the arborist who is going to be taking a look at that clearance between the trees and the building, where we were asked to look at how we might use the backyard, or subdivide it. We are going to keep it open for now. Just want to put some thought into that at a later date.

We were asked about a traffic study, and that's also in the works. We're going to have a consultant take a look at this. And our civil engineer, I'm going to show you his plan is indicating that we might have just a right turn only to make this safe and also to make sure we eliminate only two spaces instead of three. The civil engineering details, we had a comment that they may not be consistent with the plans. Our engineers, John Meyer Consulting, reviewed and confirmed that they're consistent. And they also provided additional details related to tree protection. We were asked to compare the size of units with other townhouses in the area. I have a list here of the ones in this area: Ridge Street, I know they're 1,680 to 2,400 square feet; 400 Warburton, they're 2,100; River Townhouse, 21 is 2,100; and I'm not sure the size of the ones on the bridge, but I think they're over 3,000. I have now a breakdown by each floor: these units are just under 2,000 square feet.

How many houses can fit on the lot? That was another question we were asked. That was a tough question. Because if you break this into 1,500 square foot lots you have something like this, and if you put the setbacks in you can't really build on that size of lot. I wanted to get some clarification with that question because we reviewed the minutes of the meeting and someone asked how many tax lots. Is that what you meant?

Boardmember Bass: I'm trying to get an understanding between simple compliance with the zoning code and what would that look like compared to your proposal. So in terms of number of lots, number of buildings, number of units.

Ms. Griffin: Well, it's just not that simple.

Boardmember Bass: Oh, I know.

Ms. Griffin: I think the code is complicated. It's hard to comply with it, generally. We looked at bigger lots. And even then, with 15 percent lot coverage it's just not easy because the lot coverage includes the driveways, as well.

Boardmember Bass: That's what keeps us employed.

Ms. Griffin: I'm going to take you through these drawings just so I can explain a little more the changes that we've made. I think I've gone over the site plan. This is our section through the building. We've lowered the attic so we have only 6 feet 8 to the highest point inside. This would not be ... you could not use this as a habitable space. This would always have to be a storage area. We also looked at the lowest slope we can do if we don't go to a flat roof, which is 4 in 12. We took a really hard look at the height of the buildings and remeasured them so we could see a comparison between the proposed building and the little house just uphill. The house is probably about 4 feet higher to the peak than our top of ridge. And the house on Warburton Avenue just to the south is almost the same height as the proposed building. The top of the ridge for the old two-family house is just slightly higher by, I think, 18 inches.

This was something we discussed at the last meeting, and I wanted to go over it again just to explain that we took a look at the density of the neighboring properties in the MR-1.5 zone. And the average of 24 properties – this slide did not show the average – but the average of the 24 properties that you see colored here, not including our site, is 41 percent lot coverage.

Boardmember Bass: So none of the properties in the neighborhood comply with the zoning?

Ms. Griffin: There are a few. You can see that the ones under 15 percent are dark green. Of these 24 properties, there is one that complies. We've left out the Cropsey property, which is much larger. We are now at a ... our development coverage now is 39.7 for our lot; the average of these 24 is 41. I know there was some question about how we calculate these numbers.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And where you got the numbers from.

Ms. Griffin: Yes. I'm just going to give you an example of one of the properties. I want you to pass out this property card. Greenburgh has a website, and they have tax maps and property cards. You have to do some detective work, but you can find the footprint of the building the on property card. You can usually find some kind of information about whether there's a garage on the property card. There's a photograph looking down at the property. I'm going to give you one example, and this is 15 William Street. The property card I have here is for, I believe, this building here. We have a building with a garage in back. We are using just the footprint; we're not calculating the floors above the floor area, just the footprint, just where the building touches the ground. We can do that simply because of the diagram of the footprint. I can pass this around because this shows how we figured out the footprint of the main building. We added the garage, and there's an indication of the size of garage.

On the tax maps and Google, you can approximate the size of the driveways. Then you use that total and divide it by the lot area. In this case, we got 38 percent. I can pass that around if you'd like to take a look at it. You know, it's not that precise, especially when you're calculating the driveways, but it's a guide. We've used this many times in other municipalities as a way of trying to understand density.

This is our landscape plan, which we really haven't changed. This is just the latest layout plan by the civil engineers. They're showing more detail of the driveways and how many spaces we're taking off. They gave us an update on the drainage system. They moved the large-bay storm drainage chambers so they wouldn't affect these trees, these very large trees that are here. This is an update on the sediment control related to our new driveways. These are just their details, their latest details. Now we have an analysis of the sight lines that you will have when you're coming out of the driveway, the site distance you have when you're coming out of this driveway. I could blow this up, but you might be able to see it on the plans. What we're planning to do is put a sign here so you can only go one way out of this driveway.

This is a diagram showing the sight lines for the driveway coming out that will be used for those new spots for the two-family house. The difference between what's there and what we're doing now is, we're widening the opening in the stone wall. Because of the turnaround we have in back, you go out now forward and are able to see people coming down the sidewalks, the cars coming down. It's going to be a much safer way of exiting the driveway. This is our garage plan right now, and this has been modified so that each plot is 9 by 18 minimum and actually 26 feet clearance; 25 is the minimum. We put the handicapped spot here because of the elevator location. That allowed us to get turnaround space and cut the building down by 2 feet in length. One thing we've been juggling with is trying to minimize

the size of the garage, which just happens to fit the five-unit plan we have. We don't want it to be any larger than it needs to be.

We've added a central garage entry. You enter this from a half-level up on the common walk, you come down and into the garage. This is to encourage people to come up in this direction rather than walk up from Warburton Avenue. Each resident will have their own storage or waste area. And then next to the walk, the driveway, we're going to have a fenced-off area where they can have a central collection and garbage pickup.

This is our floor plan. We made some changes so we could get the elevator and handicapped-accessible in this unit. We need to have one out of the five in order to meet New York State code. We got rid of the bump-out here because of the reduction in the length of the garage so the entire building reduced by 2 feet. And we also moved the porch up away from the front property line, away from the trees.

Other than that, the plans have remained the same. I wanted to tell you that I've added a chart to show the area of each unit. They're just under 2,000 square feet. Unit one is 1,906, and four out of the five are the same; unit four is 1,567 square feet. Our building footprint is now 4,762 square feet. It's important to ... I might want to go back to our coverage chart here because I want to explain that our footprint of the building is 7,034 square feet, which is a lot coverage of 28.5 percent. But our total development coverage is 39.7, and that's because we – and this is a little higher than what we had before – that's because we've enlarged this driveway.

I also found out from Buddy that we're only allowed a credit of 960 square feet for the driveway, which is not the way we calculated it before. I'd taken them out altogether. Even though the building coverage went down, the development coverage went up because I had to include the driveway, and this driveway became larger. I think originally we were trying to keep the driveway out of this area which will become the backyards, but the only way we can get the turnaround to work without the tight squeeze we had before is to have it in the back.

Now I'm going to go back to our architectural drawings. This is our attic. I just wanted to explain that this is not intended to be a livable space and it is not possible to have a habitable space now that we've lowered the ceiling height. The dormers are really for aesthetic reasons. A lot of traditional buildings have larger windows on the first floor and gradually get smaller as you go up. We still have the porch design. This is the big change in the roofline. Because we minimized the slope for a sloped roof 4 in 12, we decided to bring it down and have a false gable to give this house a more traditional look because the 4 in 12 roof without that is kind of a boxy, unattractive shape. This is our rear façade, and we've

reduced the height of the building by 2 feet. We still have the little dormers just for the charm and have it tie in with the neighborhood. We haven't changed this rendering yet, but we will do so to show a lower roof at some point.

This is just to show, of course, the tall trees that are here. When we had the survey updated, we had more tree heights put on our site plan because we were curious – I don't think we can see that here, that might be on the site plan – they vary, there are many tree heights here. Some of them are 66 feet tall, 65 feet tall, but most of them are more like 27 feet, 29 feet. We want to keep this as a screen, a buffer, for a variety of reasons but especially because we have that intense activity going on across the street with the auto repair shop.

I'm going to go back to the architectural drawings. We changed the rooflines on the two side elevations. We pushed the porch back into the building a little more. And now I'm going to show you the new photos that we've taken. We tried to zero in on the properties that are most affected. This is the property just south of our site, on Warburton Avenue. Actually, we took measurements with a laser device and we think we're at the same height. I'm saying that this is a nonusative (ph) measure. But we have this elevation at, I think, 18.75 and this is 18.5. That's the idea; we were trying to see if we can find a way to align our buildings with this one. I also found out from the owner that these stories have 9-foot ceilings, just as the ones we're proposing. This is the before and after shot

This is a view taken from the window of 15 William Street. I'm looking out from the apartment at the first floor over the site. This is the before picture. This is showing the tall pines, some of them up at 60 feet, some of them at 30. And this is the proposed building. This happens to be the remnants of an old foundation wall. This is a view in back of the building; this is before and after. This shows the pine trees and the townhouses. We do this by doing something called SketchUp. And we try to measure, as accurately as we can, all the building heights. We take the elevations off of topographic maps. This is a view from the little house that's almost in the middle of the site. This is on one side of the house, and you can see there's a retaining wall. This is actually the top of an old foundation wall and the pine trees in the back, and this is the change in view with the new townhouses.

This is a view on the other side of that small house, looking through the front yard. This is what it looks like now. This is one of the 60-foot high trees, this is after. These are just photographs I think we showed you before of the site. This is the driveway that we're going to widen by 3 feet on each side just to improve the visibility. This is just showing the condition of that driveway. We're trying to improve a bad situation there. This is just other views of the street showing that tall line of trees that we're going to see if we can improve but keep for the most part. This is the house. It's actually not so little – it's actually almost as deep, but narrow. The height of this platform here is at elevation 86, which is exactly where

we're having our common walk in front of our townhouses. And we're matching the height of this building.

Just other views to show. I've always felt that these townhouses are sort of in a transitional area, where over on Washington Street you've got two- and three-family houses with porches, most of them 2-1/2 stories tall. Then on Washington you have three-story buildings that have flat roofs.

Do you have any questions?

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, I have a question. I understand what you're going to do. In order to get both buildings on one lot, you're going to ask for a variance to do that.

Ms. Griffin: Absolutely. Actually, I know we'll need to ask for a variance to have two uses. Because you have a two-family house, and then when you have three or more it's a multiple dwelling.

Chairman Cameron: Right. And I think that's a good idea. I made the suggestion last time of getting the stairs down to the garage, and I'm glad you did that. I didn't mention getting rid of the stair going to the street. I see now that if you're going to have lot, you have this charming place called "common garden" over in front of the two. This is the first page, your cover page. It seems to me that if we're going to make this truly a walkable place, which it should be, that the idea that we take somebody coming out of their front door, and first they walk south 80 feet and then they go downstairs, then they walk north to go into town, it's just a mistake, I think, long term. I'm suggesting you go back and reconsider those stairs going straight down to the street, or you run a walkway straight across going directly north right through that line called common garden and have stairs going to the street down there. So people can, a) enjoy the piece of property, and b) be heading towards the town and heading towards work without having to go this way and then this way.

It sort of reminds me of that very unfortunate General Motors building in Detroit, which is built like a wall. They wouldn't let anybody into it. I understand, because I've been in that area in front of your building several times, that an awful lot of people, quite frankly, walk their dogs there and leave things. So it's not that attractive. And I know you guys will do a good job in trying to maintain it, but somehow I think in getting a more walkable place ... and I'm the one who got you to put the stairs down into the garage and make them go into it. But I still think a more walkable place is a really good idea. And one of them is, as I said, to go straight north along your property line. That wouldn't be a winter route because you wouldn't want to shovel all that, but it could be a nice nine-months-a-year route.

Boardmember O'Reilly: It's also fairly high at that corner though, isn't it?

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, it is.

Ms. Griffin: Fairly high?

Boardmember O'Reilly: "High" – it's high at that corner rather than back where it was.

Ms. Griffin: Actually, it keeps going down from 6 feet to 4 feet.

Boardmember O'Reilly: So where it was was actually ...

Chairman Cameron: Yeah, I'm fine with that one, too. Then I spotted the common garden over there, and I thought, well, if we're going to have this single lot let's have people enjoy the whole thing. Anyway, that's food for thought.

Ms. Griffin: No, we'll look into that.

Chairman Cameron: Because I really think shutting off the entire front to the southern end is not ...

Ms. Griffin: Yeah, I lived on Warburton Avenue for two years and I know what it's like. The affordable housing has a problem when people park below because it's easier. But, you know, maybe this is different. Because if you wanted to make it easier to get up here, well, you'd probably go through the back maybe.

Chairman Cameron: Well, I'm just saying the reason for the stair coming up from the garage was to make it easier once you park your car to get out to your front door. I think that's a great idea, and I like it. But it doesn't mean that you don't want to make it easier for people to walk downtown, and I don't think one is contrary to the other.

Ms. Griffin: I agree.

Chairman Cameron: The other thing is, I think we as Planning Board members should go to 15 William Street and take a look at the views. In fact, I ran into one of the persons who lives there today. We should just take a look because it's useful to do that.

And those are my comments. Anyone else have a comment?

Boardmember Bass: A couple. You took the words right out of my mouth in terms of the walkway. It makes no sense, from a user perspective, to walk south to walk north. When I visited the site, there's a break in the wall just below ... you see that dark line, where your ... go back left, left, left, keep going left – that dark line that crosses the street right by the W. There's a break in the wall right there.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, we could use that.

Boardmember Bass: And having a sidewalk there would pull people towards the Village proper. It would increase the lot coverage, but I think that's OK. Two or three iterations ago it had a similar design like this that I thought was anti-pedestrian in that it was easier to drive out of the site than to walk it. So I agree with the chairman that an additional walkway going north would make sense.

The driveway is only 12 feet wide. What's the average width of a car?

Ms. Griffin: About 5 feet 6.

Boardmember Bass: So if you had a car coming in and out, we're talking less than a foot.

Ms. Griffin: But the driveway into the townhouses on Warburton Avenue on the bridge is 9 feet 6 wide. The driveway up here is 10 feet, and it's probably been there a hundred years. Twelve feet I think is more than sufficient. We see many examples of this. The one on Warburton, there are four units there or so. But there can be a little stop sign and people can, I'm sure, control ... there's not like a huge amount of traffic coming in and out of here. But the reason for 12 feet is really to minimize the appearance, the visual impact of driveways. So many driveways in the area are very narrow. If you look at the elevations, too, we really tried to make an effort to tuck that in underneath a porch so it's not such a large garage. We don't even want a large garage door. It's very residential in scale.

Chairman Cameron: Did you go and measure the width of the one at 491-492?

Ms. Griffin: I did. Yes, I did: 9 feet 6.

Village Attorney Whitehead: They're not meant to carry two-way traffic.

Ms. Griffin: It's not meant to, no.

Boardmember Bass: But I would put money on it that you are going to have people coming in and out at some time in life.

Ms. Griffin: The follow-through (ph) onto Warburton is 12 feet. I'm working other projects, and we're trying to do one-way because we don't want to have a large curbcut. We don't want it to be commercial in scale for a variety of reasons. You can control that. You can control it electronically. You can just have a stop sign, and I think it can work.

Boardmember Bass: I wrestled with your plan, and I vacillate between being enamored with it and being troubled with it. So let me just do a stream of consciousness. Most of the buildings on the intersection are flat roof. The previous plan had the attic tall enough that it could be livable space, which I thought was a trick in terms of showing it's not livable space but it really is, wink, wink. Now you've lowered it so it's not livable space and it's storage space. So my question is, though I kind of like the design I also would be open to seeing a flat roof design. If that is just excess storage, that would reduce the visual impacts, it would be more contextual to the corner.

Ms. Griffin: We're actually considering that. There was really no effort to try to allow people to put a third floor in. I've also felt, since I've done both traditional and modern work, that a lot of the older homes have steeper roofs than 4 in 12. And that's why I had the 5 in 12. It gave us room so someone might be able to use the space. I was just trying to be very upfront about that. If I remove the false gable we had a very awkward shape. The 4 in 12 is something that's just not appealing and is something we try to avoid. You see it on Dutch colonials, where they really wanted to get more space but keep the height down, and then create this other gable just for a look. We can put nice deep overhangs so it looks like, practically, as if the building has one big gable.

The other option is flat roofs. We are kind of, well, torn. We could go either way. Because I know when you're on this side of Warburton you almost feel like you're really part of that neighborhood with the three-story flat roof buildings.

Boardmember Bass: Can you go to drawing S-1 for a second? This is kind of a general question to Buddy and to the Board. The distance between the existing two-family residence and this proposed townhouse is 39 feet and 10, almost 40 feet. In many of the jurisdictions I work in, there is a distance between buildings on the same lot, or the zoning lot, depending on if it's wall to wall, wall to window, window to window. When I read our code, I didn't see that. Do we care about that? Is that an issue? Is there a multiple dwelling concern? Because this looks like, window to window, if these were separate lots we would have a 60-foot difference between window and window; here we have 40 feet.

Chairman Cameron: You wouldn't have 60.

Village Attorney Whitehead: One's a side yard and one's a rear yard.

Boardmember Bass: OK.

Ms. Griffin: You'd have 24 feet; 12-foot minimum is the side yard.

Village Attorney Whitehead: This is a corner lot.

Chairman Cameron: Actually, you could have two separate lots. Except then you'd run into problems with the parking being in the other person's lot. Even though it's possible to do that, it's difficult.

Ms. Griffin: I'd like to make just one more comment about the attics. I just remembered, I think I've done three projects now with flat roofs that were townhouses in view preservation areas. When there's no basement and there's no attic – and I know people who live in these – it's not easy. There's nothing extra. All you have are your closets in your bedrooms. We thought it would be nice to have that little bit of attic space. There's no way to get a basement space so that's one reason we thought we would lean towards the sloped roof design.

Chairman Cameron: I have another reason against the flat roofs, and that is our new Green Code. You end up with a flat and very bright roof which, even if it didn't interfere with the view of the people up the hill, might make them feel like they were staring at the sun.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It would have to be white or silver.

Chairman Cameron: That would not work very well.

Ms. Griffin: Yeah, our code requires a solar reflectance index that makes it so you have to use something pretty bright for the flat roof.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But for people up above it, it's harsh.

Chairman Cameron: They don't have to go outside to get a suntan.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Well, I like what you've done in lowering the roof height. Although you've increased the covered area to provide for parking for the existing building, that is permeable surface. It used to be that driveways were almost always made out of impermeable surfaces. Now we have much more permeable surfaces so it's less of a concern, in my opinion. And I like the way you've reduced the length of the building by 2 feet along

Warburton. Personally, I prefer having the pitched roofs as opposed to a flat roof. I think it ties it in more with the existing building that's on the property as well, because that has a pitched roof.

I have one thing that may just be calculation errors or recording errors. On diagram S-2, the floor heights are each given as 1 foot and on diagram A-6 they are each shown as 1 foot 2 inches; which, for the three floors total, results in a 6-inch difference in the overall heights.

Ms. Griffin: I think we're flipping. I just need to coordinate the drawings so we can ... it's an error.

Boardmember Ambrozek: It's an error, OK.

Ms. Griffin: For sure.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Then, I went to the trouble of calculating the floor heights based on the number of treads, or the risers. I found the same 2-inch per floor discrepancy there.

Ms. Griffin: Here.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Yes. If you take the riser heights there and multiply it by the number of risers you will get an extra 2 inches. So it depends which one of the numbers they were starting from as to what the rise would be.

Ms. Griffin: We'll look into that and make sure the drawings are consistent. I think we've had more than one line on these drawings so I need to find out.

Boardmember Ambrozek: As you do revisions, sometimes these things don't get all changed at the same time.

Ms. Griffin: Yeah, we'll look into that and make sure we make those changes so it's consistent.

Chairman Cameron: In one of the drawings looking from the back side looking down, well, you can see the back of the buildings. Go back one – there. It seems to me that part of your planting plan should be to put in some trees so you're not just seeing the back of the house.

Ms. Griffin: Agreed, yes.

Chairman Cameron: I'm sure you're going to do that, so I just thought I'd mention it.

Ms. Griffin: That's a very good idea.

Chairman Cameron: Any more comments?

Boardmember O'Reilly: I'd be in favor of the pitched roof pure and simple, no doubt. I think it's more attractive, I think it's in keeping with the other building on the lot. Everybody said that, I just wanted to add my two cents and say I agree.

There are no entrances or exits at the rear of the property. I was just interested about that. Everybody comes out the front, nobody goes out the back. There's no exits or entrances at the rear of the property?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, every unit has a door to the back.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Has a door, OK. I didn't see that.

Chairman Cameron: You didn't see the barbecues back there?

Boardmember O'Reilly: I didn't see that. OK, so they're all there. The last question is, the driveway you have is approximately where the current gates are on the property along Warburton Avenue, or a little bit to the left?

Ms. Griffin: A little bit to the right of that.

Boardmember O'Reilly: To the right of those gates, OK.

Ms. Griffin: We have dashed the old houses here, and those gates I think are here. They're just to the right.

Chairman Cameron: Just to the right of the telephone pole.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Also, my last comment. I was sorry to see the steps at the front go.

Chairman Cameron: Right.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I liked where they were, and for me I thought it'd be preferable than sort of having another path across the common grass to get to another part of the land.

Ms. Griffin: I think making any development more pedestrian-friendly, I agree.

Chairman Cameron: Alternatively, you could actually put steps down where the last set of stairs goes up, where the porch stairs are. In other words, the last set of stairs going up to the house, just to balance it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: On the new building.

Chairman Cameron: There was this porch on the new building. You can see the steps going up. Oh, there's three porches. The far left porch.

Ms. Griffin: This one?

Chairman Cameron: Yes. Those stairs are coming down, and you just continue straight to the street.

Ms. Griffin: Yes. So you have options. You sort of have a nice flow.

Chairman Cameron: You have two options. But I think getting down to the street that way ... or anyway it's steeper there, I know.

Ms. Griffin: This wall, I think, is almost 7 feet high here. It would be a very long set of steps, so this probably makes more sense. One thing we'd like to ask you, if you could consider referring us to the Zoning Board.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think this board needs to finish their view preservation.

Ms. Griffin: Oh, you can tell us how that works.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And I know what you heard at the Zoning Board because I was there. I think you shouldn't go back to the Zoning Board until this board has really completed their view preservation analysis.

Ms. Griffin: OK.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Because the Zoning Board's going to have three things to do here. They're going to have that variance for the lot, they're going to have the coverage

variance, and the view preservation. I think what you really want is this board to reach a point where they're comfortable with the plan, comfortable with the height, can make a recommendation. Because they have to make a recommendation on the view preservation before the Zoning Board can act. And you may want them to make a recommendation on the variances that you've requested, as well.

Chairman Cameron: [off-mic].

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right. So it would be helpful to you ... you know, give this board a little more time. Let them be able to make recommendations to the Zoning Board.

Ms. Griffin: Sounds fine.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think, at that point, the Zoning Board will say, hey, great, you have these recommendations as opposed to ...

Ms. Griffin: Bouncing back and forth, yeah. Sounds good.

Village Attorney Whitehead: They made it pretty clear they'd rather you come back with the recommendations.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, OK. That makes sense.

Chairman Cameron: And they'll also have more members at that time.

So I guess we should hire an engineer? We'll hire an engineer to take a look at the stormwater. So keep on moving forward. You come back to us with the issues we raised this time, and we will go out after 15 William Street and other views before the next meeting.

Ms. Griffin: OK, great.

Boardmember Ambrozek: I just want to say, on the full Environmental Assessment Form I have a couple of questions. On page 10, at the top, which is E-1(d), you say, "*to identify any facility serving children, the elderly people with disabilities within 1,500 feet of the project site.*" One of the facilities you identify is the Phelps Memorial Hospital Center.

[cross-talk]

Ms. Griffin: All right, maybe I'm wrong about this. But I asked the engineer who prepared that question. He said it was on the list Kathy gave him. There must be an error there somewhere.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Unless they have a facility ...

Ms. Griffin: Maybe some kind of satellite facility, but I'll find out. I'll look into that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The others are all based ... well, the library, or they're based at the Community Center.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Right. Then going on to E-2(h) part two: *"Do any wetlands or other water bodies adjoin the project site?"* It says yes, and I wonder what wetlands or water bodies are adjacent to your premises.

Ms. Griffin: I didn't notice that one. I'll find out why that was put down. Nearby – does it say adjacent?

Village Attorney Whitehead: That question says adjoining.

Ms. Griffin: Doesn't seem like it should be yes.

Chairman Cameron: We didn't ask. Any comments from the audience? Sorry, we rattled on.

Yes, please sir.

Greg Hall, 15 William Street: Can you just click to the view preservation photos again, please? I'll say that again.

Village Attorney Whitehead: She's just doing something else.

Mr. Hall: So just kind of step through, in particular, the view from 15 William Street. Yeah, wow. I hear there's some reservation on the part of the Board possibly regarding flat – or what I would imagine would possibly be a sloped – roof. I appreciate the fact that there's been 2 feet removed from the overall height of the building. Still strikes me, as I'm looking at it, an awful lot of roof and an awful lot of building there. I'm looking forward to your visit so you can kind of see for yourself. I believe that's the view ground from to first floor. Did you get photos from the second floor, as well?

Ms. Griffin: We did, and I just haven't had the time to do that.

Mr. Hall: To incorporate it?

Ms. Griffin: But we're going to add that to our study.

Mr. Hall: OK. I just wonder – I mean, 15 William Street is a flat roof building. But is there not a way to design a roof that's not necessarily angular or gabled, but more a flat roof that might just be a longer slope or something that would further serve to take some height off the building? I'm just interested, curious, and want to preserve as much of the view as we possibly can. And I'm just wondering if there's opportunities in that regard. Because it sounded like you guys were open to the possibility of considering a flat or other roof design, and it just seems like maybe you could get more than 2 feet off of it.

So that's my comment.

Ms. Griffin: Well, we'll consider that.

Chairman Cameron: So which floor are you on?

Mr. Hall: I'm the property owner.

Chairman Cameron: Oh, you're the owner.

Mr. Hall: Yeah, yeah. My brother Chris and I own it.

Chairman Cameron: Oh, you're a Hall then, right.

Mr. Hall: Yeah, I'm one of them.

Chairman Cameron: I used to live next to Hall Place.

Mr. Hall: Yeah, Mr. Cameron, nice to see you.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: You left him out on this property?

Mr. Hall: Anyway, looking forward to your visit. And if there's any further thought you can give to that we'd appreciate it. Great, thank you very much.

Chairman Cameron: Could you leave your phone number?

Mr. Hall: I'll call you tomorrow.

Chairman Cameron: Then we can get better access.

Ms. Bugby: I'm directly across the street, at 35 Washington. I like what I'm seeing. I like the fact that the roof is lower. And I'm all for the pitched roof because it goes with the old convent structure that's there, and I think it's more in keeping with the historic neighborhood that we live in. Thank you.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I have some other things in the EAF, but I can ... do you want me to do them now?

Chairman Cameron: Go ahead.

Village Attorney Whitehead: On page two, under coastal resources, it says: *"Is the project site located in a community with an approved local waterfront revitalization plan?"* You checked "yes" – it's "no."

Ms. Griffin: We can fix that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I understand that some time was spent on that previously.

Ms. Griffin: It was never approved, right?

Village Attorney Whitehead: No, it was never finalized. It predates me, but it was never finalized.

Then some of the agencies that were listed – Con Ed, gas and electric, United – those aren't governmental agencies. Those don't need to be listed in the table up above.

Ms. Griffin: OK, thank you.

Chairman Cameron: All right?

Ms. Griffin: All right, thank you so much.

Chairman Cameron: Well, we'll see you at our next meeting or whenever you come.

Ms. Griffin: OK.

Chairman Cameron: Thank you very much.

I think that is our agenda. A couple things. We have the meeting on June 18.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Do you want them to put anything up so you can see the height?

Chairman Cameron: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Wait. Christina?

Chairman Cameron: We are going to need to find a way of putting something up so we know the height when we get there. So we may approach you about putting something in a tree or something.

Ms. Griffin: I talked to Andrew about that. We can do that – a balloon – or let us know.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Balloons don't ... they blow.

Ms. Griffin: I don't know what the easiest way is now, but we'll figure it out.

Chairman Cameron: You want to stand up there on a ladder? Just kidding.

Dep. Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Could she tie some ribbons on the trees at height? Would that help?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Like a flag?

Ms. Griffin: Oh, yes. Well, it's not in line with the building but I'll discuss it with Andrew and we'll come up with an idea.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right, the trees are further forward. Somehow put a pole?

Chairman Cameron: And another thing which I didn't really mention, but I mentioned at the last meeting, is that you have the trees in front of the buildings, which I think is a good idea. We're going to need, as part of the planning plan, a way of semi-permanently keeping the trees. Because I think the buildings, even though you've made them smaller, are still fairly large and they kind of loom over Warburton. It would be good to make sure we have trees there so the buildings don't look as big, even though they look beautiful.

Ms. Griffin: You know what's interesting? Four-hundred Warburton, they are set back 16 feet and they're up on the plinth kind of, in a way. It's amazing the difference that makes.

Chairman Cameron: To be back that far.

Ms. Griffin: To be set back, yeah.

Chairman Cameron: No, I think it's farther back.

VI. OLD BUSINESS - None

VII. DISCUSSION ITEMS - None

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting Date – June 18, 2015

Chairman Cameron: First of all, we have a meeting June 18. And I also wanted to mention that – and this is something that Christina was involved in – if you go to 400 Warburton and you look over the wall you can see our wonderful staircase going down to the Quarry Trail which they're putting in, which we actually got the developer to do. I think it's great, and I'm sure there'll be a grand opening at some time. There's no rails so you can't go down it, but anyway I just wanted to mention that. And Christina was the architect on that.

Ms. Griffin: It wasn't easy to figure it out.

Chairman Cameron: When I think of the other trail, I smile because I'm a trail person at heart.

And the other thing, and we'll talk about it another time, this development on Lawrence Street by Jefferson. They are talking about 396 units, down to about 370 now.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I thought it was 270.

Chairman Cameron: Yes, 296 down to 270. It is going to be like 350 to 400 cars. They've gone around and met with various people in town trying to do P.R. The major problem for

us is the fact that it compares so badly to the one we just finished approving, the Ginsburg development. The sheer number of automobiles and more hard surface, I think they have a serious problem on the traffic up there. I don't think they understand that most people who get in the car on Lawrence, if they're going down the throughway they're actually going to go over and down Jackson Avenue through the back way. They're not going to go out to the throughway and pay that toll because nobody likes to pay the toll if they go south. It's almost like it's built in to everybody. Same thing coming back.

Good luck in trying to get across Saw Mill River Parkway on foot if you happen to want to walk over to the new development. You're going to get killed. Oh, there you are. I had a meeting with the developer, and there are lots of things we didn't like about it. But we don't really have a vote.

Boardmember Ambrozek: Jamie, I would like to say before we close that I would really like to have the Village publicize the need that a property owner should get a building permit whenever they make any changes on their property to any structure whether that is an addition, a removal, or just a change. They are required to contact the Building Department and, if necessary, get a building permit. And I'd like to see that perhaps publicized in the Village calendar or other Village information centers.

Chairman Cameron: Particularly if it has gasoline there. We don't want you going over there.

IX. ADJOURNMENT