

VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
JANUARY 16, 2020

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, January 16, 2020 at 8:15 p.m. in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

PRESENT: Chairperson William O'Reilly, Boardmember Kathleen Sullivan, Boardmember Kerry Gould-Schmidt, Boardmember Emily Goldman, Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., Planning Consultant Patrick Cleary, Deputy Building Inspector Steven Stanislawczyk, and Planning Board Secretary Mary Ellen Ballantine

Chairman O'Reilly: Good evening. We have a quorum, welcome. This is the meeting of the Planning Board, Village of Hastings-on-Hudson, Thursday, January 16. Could we have the roll call, please?

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRPERSON

Chairman O'Reilly: This being the first meeting of the year, there is an item of business which has to be attended to. I'll ask Linda.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, this board – annually, at the first meeting of the year – has to reappoint its chairman or vote for a chairman. I know there's only four of you here tonight, but we can try to do it.

Chairman O'Reilly: Try to do it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So does anybody want to nominate someone or nominate Bill to continue, or nominate somebody else?

Boardmember Sullivan: I'd like to nominate Bill to continue as chair.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I second.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you, I'm willing to do that.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Whitehead: Good thing.

Boardmember Sullivan: You would have to talk to the two of us if we'd gotten down that path.

On MOTION of Boardmember Sullivan, SECONDED by Boardmember Gould-Schmit, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved re-elect Chairman O'Reilly to continue as Planning Board chairman.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You got it: Bill continues as the chair.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Thank you for your service, Bill.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You're doing a great job.

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, thank you for your confidence. Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of October 17, 2019

Meeting of November 21, 2019

Meeting of December 19, 2019

Chairman O'Reilly: The first item is approval of minutes, and we have a list. October 17th I don't think we can do, can we?

Village Attorney Whitehead: You're not going to be able to do any minutes, I don't think.

Chairman O'Reilly: I don't think so.

Village Attorney Whitehead: 'Cause Kerry wasn't here last month.

Boardmember Sullivan: Nor was Bill.

Chairman O'Reilly: Emily wasn't here for October, so there's only the two of us, Kathleen.

So we cannot do October 17th, November 21st, or December 19th. Deferred to a future meeting.

IV. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Site Plan Approval & View Preservation Advisory – Application of 15 Spring Street Realty, LLC for the demolition of the existing building and construction of a new structure, creating a mixed-use occupancy to include 10 parking spaces in the basement, two retail spaces on the first level, and six dwelling units on the second and third levels at their commercial property located at 15 Spring Street. Said property is in the CC Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-22-34 on the Village Tax Maps.**

[This Public Hearing has been Deferred to Future Meeting]

- 2. View Preservation Advisory & Site Plan Approval – Application of River Road, LLC, for the creation of a new greenhouse and exterior renovation at their property located at 100 River Street. Said property is located in the MW Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-19-4 on the Village Tax Maps.**

[This Public Hearing has been Deferred to Future Meeting]

- 3. View Preservation Advisory, Steep Slopes Approval & Site Plan Approval – Application of Riverton Lofts West, LLC for the construction of a new seven-dwelling, multi-family unit on an existing lot, with associated parking, located at 10 West Main Street. Said property is in the CC Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.70-48-13 on the Village Tax Maps.**

[This Public Hearing has been Deferred to Future Meeting]

- 4. View Preservation Advisory & Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Gabriel & Katalin Ce for a rear addition and retaining walls on the two-family dwelling located at 280 Warburton Avenue. Said property is located in the R-7.5 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.100-96-11 on the Village Tax Maps.**

[This Public Hearing has been Deferred to Future Meeting]

Chairman O'Reilly: Our old public hearings, we have one, two, three, four that have been deferred to future meetings. That is, for various reasons: 15 Spring Street; the property at 100 River Street; the property at 10 West Main Street; and the property at 280 Warburton Avenue. Public hearings deferred to a future meeting, hopefully not the one meeting.

New public hearings, therefore. We move to that.

V. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Pouria Dehgan for an addition of a patio, fire pit, retaining walls, walkway, and garden at her single-family dwelling located at 5 Riverview Place. Said property is located in the 2-R Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-20-30 on the Village Tax Maps**

Chairman O'Reilly: You are here to present. If you could come forward with your plan, and if you're going to use ... over there, which is fine, you'll need to use this microphone. And please be sure to speak into it, introduce yourself, who you are, and we're happy to listen.

Sean Jancski, landscape architect: Can I move this over?

Chairman O'Reilly: We're fine with that, if you may. But there may be people here that are interested in it so you might want to twist it a little bit more, make it flat.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So the public can see it.

Chairman O'Reilly: Flat to the wall.

Mr. Jancski: Got it.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Whoever's going to present has to be holding the mic to their mouth, okay?

Mr. Jancski: All right. Good evening. I'm here with my associate, Jackie Helms, also a landscape architect. Nadine Dehgan, the homeowner, is here in the audience if that becomes useful. Thanks very much for hearing the application, and I'll be happy to kind of walk you through what the scope of work is.

Probably the most useful thing we can look at is a photograph, or two photographs, that show some current condition views of the top of the steep slope that we're trying to clean up. To describe some of the work, the scope of work includes a couple of retaining walls at the top of the slope to create a little bit more usable space for my client and her family, to create some vegetable gardens and things like that, some walking areas.

The work will include removing some of the noxious invasives that you can see on the hill, replacing them with new native plantings. There's a small sitting patio – round sitting area – to take advantage of the views. And some steps so they can get a little bit better access to the hillside and try to enjoy it because it's a big part of their property and one of the reasons they bought the property.

There are two retaining walls as part of the scope. You can kind of see them on the plans that have been submitted. This is the area that would be access for vegetable gardens and things like that. And these are the natural boulder steps that could provide a little bit more access for them to use the hillside.

Chairman O'Reilly: If I could just, as a question, hold your photo up again and just point to where those parts are that you're describing on that over there for us.

Mr. Jancski: Thank you. So these are sort of two opposing views. Here are the train tracks, here's my client property. This is where the sitting area that's on the plans will be. This is the area that two walls would be constructed to create a little bit of a level terraced area. And this is the same area looking north. So this is looking south, this is looking north. There's the garage you see on the plan, and here's the river. So we'd be working on the top part of the hill.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Jancski: Also included in the plans are a stormwater management plan prepared by a professional engineer, Alan Pilch, that shows some CULTEC systems in the level portion of the yard to make sure to collect any of the impervious runoff to minimize any potential for runoff on the hill. There'll be no impact to neighbors, and we think the scope of work is largely in keeping with the requirements of the steep slopes ordinance.

So that's kind of a summary of the project. Be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman O'Reilly: I asked one – that was mine. Any questions on my left?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: No. I mean, just the engineer report was given to the applicant, this one?

Village Attorney Whitehead: No. Was it given to them?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I sent this via e-mail.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I mean, you're lucky you're not impacting any neighbors. View-wise, I think you're fine. I do think there are ... you know, we send out the plans to an

outside engineer, and I think there were some things to be considered in that. I don't know if you've seen the memo, or ...

Mr. Jancski: I'm not sure if I have.

Village Attorney Whitehead: They're pretty minor.

Chairman O'Reilly: Two pages.

Mr. Jancski: I may just not be thinking about this right now.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: You know, from my perspective – and Kathy probably has better points on this than me, maybe landscape-wise. I'm okay with the plan, provided that the issues in the Hahn memo are addressed.

Mr. Jancski: Okay. We have a pretty good engineer on board and I think he's addressed most, and if he hasn't I could maybe ask that if you are willing to grant approval it'd be conditional on all the conditions of the engineer memo.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I spoke with Doug Hahn today and he wouldn't have a problem with that.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Okay, it's in the memo.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Buddy, he also puts in a comment that site plan details should be provided. Could you just once again remind Hahn that this is not site plan approval?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Right. I did remind him of that when I sent them the application that a site plan will be handled upon delivery.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right, this is just for steep slopes.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: This is strictly for steep slopes.

Boardmember Sullivan: I have one question. I think it's a lovely approach, I mean capturing the sort of flat terrace, making it usable for the client, and doing the gardens. It's just very, very nice.

This is sort of a general question about stormwater retainage because I think you're capturing, if I'm not mistaken, all of the runoff from the existing flat part and then the additional surfaces you're putting in. Is that correct?

Mr. Jancski: That's correct.

Boardmember Sullivan: My question is, don't we try to capture the excess, the new that's created, and not so much the existing? Because in this case, this once was just sort of a natural slope. I mean, it was a flat part and it had a slope down. I don't know if there's any erosion that was problematic. But what you're adding, I think, is what you capture, not so much the whole kit and kaboodle from the existing. So that's just a general question. Because you're putting in four CULTECs, right?, for a lot of the impervious. You don't seem to be adding that much impervious surface to the project.

Mr. Jancski: Well, there are some: the walkway here, the walls. I think it's really to make sure we follow the criteria, the amount of rainfall that has to be collected to ensure there is no chance we're creating erosion.

Boardmember Sullivan: I understand. I just think the issue of capturing what was already there, the point Hahn brought up that stays with me, is that the runoff naturally is just kind of going across the slope from north to south. And you've captured it and are actually making it into sort of more of a point source, for lack of a better word. I mean, you think about why not let the natural kind of runoff occur and then capture if you need to the new you're creating. That's just a point to Hahn I guess, Buddy.

We're asking a lot because you're putting in more disturbance to what these CULTECs are doing. And it just seems maybe there's a way you can continue to use the natural runoff, the natural drainage of the site, and deal with what you've added.

Mr. Jancski: I think that's good for everybody. We're all for that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Buddy, I think you can just pass that along to Hahn.

Chairman O'Reilly: That's a good point.

Mr. Jancski: As long as we can meet all the drainage requirements, I like your approach and I think we're on board.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes, but I think also too like you're creating a garden. So, I mean, that itself could potentially have aspects of a rain garden if you wanted to go that kind of route.

Mr. Jancski: Yeah.

Boardmember Sullivan: And so I mean there's just other ways, maybe, of kind of keeping this. Because I think what you're doing is a very nice addition, I think a very beautiful place

to sit out there.

Chairman O'Reilly: I looked at the site today. I mean, I looked at it from the side. I didn't get down and climb onto the cliff or the outside part, but there's a lot of open space. I mean, there's a lot of lawn between the house and the point that you're going to, which is open already. And there's a stormwater drain at the bottom of the street.

Mr. Jancski: Yes, right here.

Chairman O'Reilly: Right there. Do you intend to tie into that at all? I mean, that's obviously for the street and not for the property.

Mr. Jancski: No. It's a completely on-site system.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay.

Mr. Jancski: No new load on the stormwater system.

Chairman O'Reilly: But anyway, I take your point and I think ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: So you want me to recommend to Hahn that we don't use the drywells at all here?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just what needs to be done for the new impervious surface.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Right, okay.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Don't overdo.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yep, gotcha.

Chairman O'Reilly: Emily?

Boardmember Goldman: Yes, that sounds good.

Chairman O'Reilly: Any further questions? Then I think we have ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Do you want to ask anybody in the public?

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, that's what I was thinking. Anybody out there to speak on this? No?

Well then, I think we can say that what I'd like is a motion to approve the application of Pouria Dehgan for the addition of a patio, fire pit, retaining walls, walkway and garden – the single-family dwelling – with anything that might be included in the Hahn report, with the addition of perhaps not doing as much as was intended for water runoff and stormwater management. Does that sound reasonable?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, subject to Hahn's approval.

Chairman O'Reilly: Subject to Hahn's approval.

On MOTION of Boardmember Gould-Schmit, **SECONDED** by Boardmember Sullivan, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved to approve the application of Pouria Dehgan for the addition of a patio, fire pit, retaining walls, walkway and garden – the single-family dwelling – with anything that might be included in the Hahn report, with the addition of perhaps not doing as much as was intended for water runoff and stormwater management and subject to Hahn's approval.

Mr. Jancski: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Boardmember Sullivan: Good luck.

Chairman O'Reilly: We move on to our second public hearing.

2. View Preservation Advisory & Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Ryan Kimber & Meghan Golden (Contract Vendee) for a new single-family dwelling on their prospective property at Zero Pinecrest Parkway. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.100-95-41 on the Village Tax Maps

Chairman O'Reilly: This is an application, and I take it you are Mr. Steinschneider?

Boardmember Sullivan: He will tell us that.

Chairman O'Reilly: I just wanted to be sure.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: He's not usually this far south. He's usually in Dobbs.

Village Attorney Whitehead: He shows up here once in a while.

Paddy Steinschneider, Gotham Design: So tell me when to go.

Chairman O'Reilly: You may begin.

Mr. Steinschneider: Thank you, sir. We're the land use planners and designers for the Kimbers, who are looking to purchase a piece of property to build their dream house on Pinecrest Parkway, which is a very interesting street. It's got a lot of different kinds of houses on it, and it's got big and it's got small. And it seems to be getting some interesting development recently with what looks like very nice houses that are going in. So I think it's a good street.

You can see the site. The site here is at the end of Pinecrest Parkway. One of the things I want to point out in this is, this lot is the anomaly in this neighborhood. All of the other properties on Pinecrest have a frontage on the street, so their front yards are either their east yard or their west yard. This piece of property – because the road does not continue onto the site – their technical front yard is actually their south property line. So what that does is it kind of reverses where the fronts and the backs and the sides are, which is one of the issues that we've got and something we're trying to deal with.

It's a large – relatively large – lot for this neighborhood. It's a little bit more than 14,000 square feet, and it's very steeply sloped. It's actually so steeply sloped that it's a primary consideration, and anything we're able to do on this site – trying to work with that, make use of it – but also it has implications when it comes to our heights and how that all works, which I'll take you through in a moment. The concern that we have for placement of what we can do on the site is very much affected by the fact that this site has a very large easement that cuts across it. The whole east end of the property is an easement in favor of 179 Broadway, which is the next property to the north.

Actually, if I go to the survey here you can see that, effectively, the street almost does continue. The width of paving on this property is the same width as Pinecrest Parkway and it extends up to the 179 property. While they've got frontage on Broadway, this is their access to their garage. So we've been careful to not do anything that ... you know, not that we could encumber, we're not allowed to. So we've respected that, and that has affected where we can build and what we can build on the property.

These are the drawings that were submitted to you which show the site plan. The gray area there in the front is a parking courtyard. One of the things we wanted to try and do here is separate the cars that would be for this house from the cars that would be coming in, going into the ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: The pointer doesn't work on the screen.

Mr. Steinschneider: That's okay.

Chairman O'Reilly: We can watch on anything else but the screen.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You can take the handheld mic and go across. Or take the handheld and ...

Mr. Steinschneider: No, it's fine. So the gray area is a parking courtyard. The part of the house that's immediately to the north of that gray is the garage. And the front door is where you see that little cut into the front of the house which, if you notice, the house pretty much lines up with the next house to the south. So what we've done is, we've kind of respected that street line so that when you come up Pinecrest Parkway you would see this house being a logical end to that screen.

This is what we submitted actually for the Zoning Board, but I thought it was helpful here because what we've grayed in are the two portions of the house that exceed – that project into – the north yard and the south yard. So if the south yard is the front yard, it's supposed to be 30 feet. And what we've done is proposed reversing the 30s and the 15s so they align, which what is on the street; have the side-yards-to-side-yard; have the front to the east, have the back to the west.

Same thing here. These are the floor plans. I don't think we need to spend time – at least not tonight – going into that. It's a three-bedroom house with a den/guest room on the first floor. This, again, is the zoning, which shows the portions of the house that would project into those required front and rear setbacks. Same thing as we get to the elevations. The top right is the east elevation that's facing the easement when you come in off the end of Pinecrest. The elevation to the left, the south, shows that for the most part we're trying to be very calm on the north and south façades; not having a lot of windows looking into neighbors' homes.

Same thing on the north side. We've tried to be fairly understated with the number of windows, what rooms are facing there, so it wouldn't be something where people are sitting, say, where the space above the garage, the attic, is looked right into the house. Because the house at 179 is actually fairly close, although it sits further up the hill.

This is that elevation for the Zoning Board which, again, shows where those lines of 15 versus 30 feet would cut into the house. Trying to build on the lot with just the 30-foot width that's permitted would be relatively challenging to do and would probably trigger other things that I don't think would be as beneficial for neighbors, such as the driveway coming around on the north side where you'd have an awareness of activity there instead of privacy.

These are sections, and what you can see in the sections is how we've worked to step down the hillside, respecting that steep slope. But for the most part, we're actually having to fill to get up to the floor levels. The drop-off is so steep that we actually can't ... we don't want to

go so far down in the ground that we would have like a 20-foot basement or something.

This drawing is one that I think helps understand that. It's two diagrams that explain how the height that we've proposed relates to – in our interpretation – an appropriate way to scale this so it does fit. The top drawing, the dark line is compliant. That dark line actually is 8 feet taller than what we've proposed. But what it would do is, it would shift square footage out of the middle of the house and pull it up to be ... you'd have a full two-story house up on the east end, which would mean that you're that much higher affecting people's views. Given the concern with view preservation, it seemed very logical that we would try and keep this house down as much as we could.

So we've actually stepped *down* the slope with the first floor, and that's given us a ridge line which is ... we originally wanted to be no higher than the basement floor of the house at 177 that's up the street. What we are right now is about 1-1/2 feet to 2 feet. If we can do some work with grading on the driveway we would be able to probably drop down about 2 feet more. We've shown the worst case scenario, which is where that grade area is the amount of the roof that penetrates through the sky plane. That's on this side. On the other side of the house we're fully under it. And if we drop the house down 2 feet it eliminates a good portion of that. But again, I think it's the height of the ridge on the east side that's the most effect on anyone, you know, that's up the hill trying to see the river.

The lower drawing shows the effect we have from the easement itself. If we didn't have to address the easement, the exact same house shifted a little bit further to the east fits fully under the sky exposure plane. So it's really a matter of accommodating the steep slopes, accommodating the easement, and the fact that the site actually slopes ... as much as it slopes from the east to the west, it's also sloping from the south to the north. So it's that north end that's almost like a hole that's under the house. I would suggest it's not so much of an issue with the height of the house as it is with the depth of the bottom. So if you're measuring from the bottom you're measuring from 6 feet below the basement slab up to the roof. So it affects how that calculation works.

This is our landscaping plan. I appreciate that the Village planner and Hahn both have ... I think the word that Mr. Cleary used was "robust." So our goal is to have a very well-screened house that would establish, you know, good screening so this would feel like it really fit into the hill. It would feel very soft from the neighbors to the north. And at the east end, from the south, we also have a retaining wall in the back to give a section of level lawn. We've kept the trees down there, but were augmenting that, too, because of course at the bottom of this property is the Aqueduct. And that is a precious resource that is very enjoyed in this community, as well as 26 miles of the park. So it's really something special, and we want to respect that.

So a very careful landscaping plan, I think, really helps with this. One of the points Mr.

Cleary also had was maybe instead of spruce we could find some pines that would work.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Well, it's "Pinecrest."

Mr. Steinschneider: It's on Pinecrest Parkway so maybe more pine trees instead of spruce trees. But I'll go back to the landscape architect on that.

The next three drawings ... Tom is here from Hudson Engineering. Tom, if you want to come ... I don't know if there's going to be any questions about it, but do you want to present these or do you want me to just rattle through it?

Hudson Engineering Representative (Tom): (Off-mic) if they have questions about ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Okay. This drawing shows the steep-sloped areas. Those are the ones that are light green and dark green. As you can see, the only sections of this site that are not steeply sloped are the easement itself and the area where ... right down on that kind of lower portion on the south where we have proposed putting our drainage system. So, you know, you'd rather not build that on a slope so we've used that area for that. But it's not as though we could shift the house some way, move it some different way, do a different orientation and not be affecting the steep slopes. If I understand the code correctly – and it's not my ... you know, I get told how that works, I don't tell you guys – the goal here is to make sure we're not doing anything that would be injurious or unstable, or result in erosion sedimentation or be unsightly.

I think we've given good thought to all of those issues in the way the foundation works. And there is a letter, I think, that we need to still provide, which is a narrative. It talks about *exactly* what we're doing to stabilize the steep slopes and protect them, and make sure we don't have problems with erosion and sedimentation. That gets, to an extent, with Hudson. They've prepared our drainage plan as well as our erosion and sediment control plan. These are the details they've provided; you know, very standard stuff but carefully worked out. If I go back here to the landscaping – and it's a little bit more coordination I think we have to get between the landscaper and the engineer – part of our idea here, which goes to what Ms. Sullivan was saying a little earlier – we're picking up water. And our goal is not to collect all that water and stick it in the ground as much as we can.

We're also aware of the fact that right now the water is sloping down this site and is going towards the trees along the Aqueduct. It's feeding those. So what we've created is, you know, almost like a little culvert groundwater where the water can come off, run down the slope, and get to the shrubs, the trees, and continue to feed the trees along the Aqueduct.

I think we're now up to everything we showed for view preservation. We looked at as many points we could get access to. We're certainly willing to do more if that's needed. It looks

crazy with all those arrows, but if you want ... you know, it traces through. The first thing we did is, we just looked at, you know, context in here; really, this large slope and, if you will, where most of the sediment ended up in the Ice Age on this side of the river, with the rocks cut on the other side.

We've got this very large hill, heavily forested. The site has, you know, significant trees all around it. We did find shots that were taken in winter so we could kind of see what it really looks like a little bit more open (actually, that's moving it myself). Let's see, interesting. It's really moving. That's good, Rico. Okay, so back to here and no longer in the thing. Okay, there we go. We're pointing to where the site is. As you can see in the upper right-hand, the 179 house is to the north of the site. They've got, you know, really nice decks and all facing out towards the river. That makes great sense. You can see the house that's up the slope which is being rebuilt at this point, 177. Then you've got the next house to the south, which is significantly to the south looking out over ... it's really got nice views between the homes along the other side of the street, which are relatively low. The house we're proposing is about 3 feet higher than the house there to the south of the site.

The house to the side is very close to our property line, which is one of the reasons that we have talked about heavy, extensive landscaping along there to maintain that sense of privacy. If we go through, looking at pre- and post, this is standing on Pinecrest looking up towards the lot. The structure, the kind of salmon-colored building you see there in the middle, that's the garage of 179. You can see how the house we're proposing kind of sits back in so it's not really blocking the view looking up the street.

Here is looking from Broadway, looking between 179 and 177. You see the house down below again. It's down in the tree line, it's not projecting up above that to block the views of the river itself. This is a little bit further down on Broadway between 177 and the neighbor to the south. Here, we're actually in 177 on that deck. This is actually the top deck. And the house is drawn in there, it's just really hard to see. You know, there's a lot of foliage between this house and the proposed.

This is from the basement level in that house, looking out. So you see again we're down below the tree line, which I think fits in fairly well. This is another one from the upper deck, looking across. I think this is in the middle of the site. And this is from the neighbor on the Broadway side to the south of 177. This is a photo we took off the online. We haven't been in the house. I'd like to actually get in and see some of the views they've got. We could also add to augment this with that. But again, you see in the bottom that where we're sitting down is not really affecting their view. Obviously you'd be able to see the house, but it's not blocking it. Then we did the same for ... actually this is mislabeled, it says 167 and that needs to be changed. That's 179.

So this is looking down. You can see the house, to the left in the lower photo. Again, that's

to the southeast. So it's not between 179 and the river, but it is a house that you would see. Basically, when you're standing on that deck you're looking over the ridge. These are just photos we have, contextual, so you understand how we're fitting in. But I think you guys probably know the property better than I do. The lower right photo is one I think is important because it's really showing how steep this drop-off is. It really is a steep slope.

Here, these are the views from the property. The three upper two and the one on the left are kind of looking out panoramically at the river. The one below is looking down the slope to the Aqueduct, which I think is one of the charms of this property: the idea of, you know, young kids being able to walk in on the Aqueduct into town. Here's some more context photos. The one in the lower right-hand corner is the house to the south, which you can see has kind of some similarities in the steep pitched roofs, the gables, that we've picked up on.

These are photos from down on the Aqueduct. The upper left is looking up at 179; upper right is looking up at the site. Then the lower left is looking at the house to the south of the lot that we're dealing with, and bottom is just one I wanted to include because it's a really great shot of the Aqueduct. Then this kind of summarizes how all that works, with the proposed house stepping down the hillside, 177 up the slope, the basement level of 177 being about 1-1/2 feet lower than the ridge line of the Pinecrest house.

The other thing, I just want to make a quick point in closing on it. Often when we're doing projects we have a lot of say in guiding the client in the directions they could look at. The Kimbers arrived much more prepared than that. They had obviously spent a tremendous amount of time figuring out exactly the kind of house they really wanted, and they provided us with an extensive file with lots of images they had saved over the years of both interior and exterior shots. We've respected that, and this is a house they're looking to build for themselves and raise kids in. They want it to be something that really is the kind of house they want. The question is, can we build that house on this site.

Chairman O'Reilly: That's what we're here to find out. Thank you, you're very thorough. You certainly have a set of challenges there. I know there are six variances which are required which are fairly substantial, but that's not for us to do. It's already gone to the Zoning Board. We're concerned tonight with the view preservation and steep slopes review.

I think what I'd like to do – since you referred to Patrick Cleary – is just stop. He has prepared a fairly thorough memorandum of points ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Very thorough.

Chairman O'Reilly: ... which you may have seen, which I think should be presented publicly. We also have a letter from a neighbor at 179 Broadway, which you may have seen.

Mr. Steinschneider: Yep.

Chairman O'Reilly: And probably we have people here who wish to speak to the issue, as well. But I'd like to, if it's okay, start with Patrick's review, which has been pretty thorough.

Mr. Steinschneider: And I will sit down if it's okay with you.

Chairman O'Reilly: What's that?

Mr. Steinschneider: I'll sit down?

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes ... which is reviewed, and deals both with view preservation and steep slopes. But I think since you've presented everything we should look at those issues, as well.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Sure, I'll summarize Mr. Chairman. Paddy did a terrific job of explaining the project, really did a very good job. But a few things. So as you heard, this site is extremely burdened by the presence of those steep slopes. And given the limitations of the zoning parameters in those steep slopes, as Paddy indicated there's no place to put the house. It's here, or it's not here; the alternative is a smaller building. It's not as though there's a better place on the site to put the building, so that's really the issue we're dealing with in this particular case.

Of the six variances, it is really the height variance that relates to view preservation and, in turn, relates to the slope issue that relates to the height. Again, you head it: there's about a 42-foot drop in elevation from the top of that site to the lower portion of the site. I provided, in the memorandum, some of the excerpts from the steep slope law which provide you with guidance in making your determination relative to the suitability of the encroachments.

Again just for context, of those steeply-sloping categories over 70 percent of those areas are impacted by the proposal. That's a significant number. The code allows you to consider up to 25 percent, I think, and there it's 70 percent. So that's the magnitude of the encroachment we're talking in this particular instance. Paddy referred to it: the steep slopes ordinance requires a narrative explaining how they are addressing those impact issues, so that's something that needs to be supplemented in the submission that's before you.

There is, as referred to earlier, a retaining wall on the rear of the property. There are some elevations of that retaining wall, we just need to confirm that that height remains compliant throughout the length of the retaining wall. I think it does, but that's a verification.

There is some tree removal that's necessary as a result of this – by and large not all that significant – and they're perimeter trees. One issue with regards to some of that tree removal

is, there is the access easement across the front of the property. I think there's a sewer easement. And there's also an easement that runs along the side property line, as well, for a portion of that property. Paddy's showing some grading in that area which requires some tree removal. But what's underneath there is influenced by what you're doing on top of it, so we have to make sure that grading doesn't affect those sewer lines that are underneath the property in that particular location.

Again, I made some comments about the landscaping. And the comment about Pinecrest is flippant to a certain degree. but is ...

Male Voice: (Off-mic), right?

Planning Consultant Cleary: There's a reason for names sometimes. So if there's a palette to be chosen, why not choose some of those selected species?

The easement for the access, if you could provide us with the limitations of that easement. One of the constraints in the property is that they don't have any ability to move in that area. Is that, in fact, legally prohibited or just we're trying to be nice to our neighbors? It would be useful to know that. The view preservation is a significant one and, again, I think the illustrations were illustrative. There are encroachments into views to a certain degree, and Paddy commented that you'll see the house in certain locations. Seeing the house is not an issue necessarily, particularly if it's an attractively designed home. Whether or not it impacts those views, however, is your charge to determine.

So again, the whole issue here with respect to this application relates to is there flexibility to modify. Paddy referred to one instance where if he could only buy a couple of additional feet into that easement area perhaps he can lower the home. I think those are the kinds of things that might warrant some further exploration, and that might achieve some of your goals to minimize those impacts. But again, the provision is there's no other place to put the house. So it's really setting it lower into the slope, which has its consequences, or reducing the size of the house.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you. One of the comments made in the Gotham statement here – and I don't know whether it's for us to determine whether this determines steep slopes discussion – it says: "Context of the neighborhood would suggest that the front property line be the east property line." I mean, is that open to discussion? I mean, it seems ... how does that determine what we do with the east property line? I mean, it is the east property line, right?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: This property line is not on a street. How could it be the front of a house?

Chairman O'Reilly: Right. So what is it on if it's not on a street?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: The front of the house is the south side.

Chairman O'Reilly: It always looked to me like the continuation of 179's driveway. But is it actually accessible?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: The driveway? Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: It's not a sheer driveway. Or it will be a sheer driveway so it requires that easement?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It goes through their property, yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: All right.

Planning Consultant Cleary: And just one other point I thought of. One of Paddy's comments was that "I'm limited by the grade of my driveway." And in fact, there isn't really a driveway; there's the parking court that we explained earlier. So that has to be leveled flat, but its elevation can be adjusted.

Chairman O'Reilly: Right. So perhaps we should be starting with the view preservation discussion, which I think we can lead into. I have a few questions, but I'm not going to start. Actually, we have a letter which maybe I'll read the letter from the neighbor at 179 who is talking to the view preservation issue:

"Dear members of the Planning Board,

"We are reaching out our concerns for the proposed construction plans for the Kimber residence, Pinecrest Parkway in Hastings-on-Hudson. We, the owners of 179 Broadway, which is the lot adjacent to the north and northeast of the proposed residence.

"If the builders propose, this new residence will have a significant negative impact on our property value and views of the home. The Kimbers' home, as planned, will obstruct our views to the southwest; rooms that currently have an open Hudson River view to the southwest which we believe will be obstructed. We've attached photos that capture the views" – and they presented a couple – "which most impact our home at 179 New Broadway. These photos are largely not captured in the existing proposal.

"We kindly request that they submit an as-of-right house for review meeting the existing zoning requirements for new construction in a view preservation district. Living next door to this property, we believe that there are better options for siting and dimensions for this proposed home that will not negatively obstruct our neighboring view of the Hudson River.

"We thank you in advance for your time and consideration. We are happy to share any further information that would be helpful to both the Planning Board as well as the new potential owners."

I should mention that the appropriate public notice of the application was circulated as necessary, and that is one thing which we have. Let me just put that into the record. It should be there.

I open it up to the board, here, for questions and discussion.

Boardmember Sullivan: I have other things, but I'd like to just put this out here for the board. I mean, there substantial variances that have to be considered so I think it might be helpful for us to give our thoughts about view preservation and steep slopes. But I don't feel comfortable making any decisions tonight.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You won't me making any. We already know he's got to submit the narrative on the steep slopes, but I think it would be helpful for the board to give their comments if they need to make some revisions to the plan before they even go to the Zoning Board.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, I understand. That's what I think is a good approach.

Chairman O'Reilly: We'll hold public questions until we get to that point, if you don't mind, because we have things to discuss up here. I'd like to get that out. So if you could please listen to our discussion, then as they relate we'll ask for the public comment at the right time.

One of the things that strikes me is that I went to the site again today – and I've been there before – to have a look at the construction. So having looked at some of the plans, I then went back to have a look a second time. It is, as I've said, a challenging project.

The thing which strikes me is, it is still – in terms of view preservation – a lot of possibly this and approximately that; these things I thought of there. We've struck these computerized versions of what a house is going to look like on a map, and then found that sometimes they don't agree with what we find to be the actual measurements. I was looking up at 177, which seems to be the house that's going to be the most impacted, it would seem. But we'd want to

get in, I think, to have a look at what it is going to look like. But also to get a real approximation. Because the other thing – I said I wasn't going to ask questions, but here's my other comment – is that I looked down the slope and then I looked to the left at 115, which is the last house on the currently existing Pinecrest Parkway. Which seems to take off from about the same level as what you'll be describing.

The height of that, I would be wondering what the elevation point of the proposed house is in comparison to the elevation level of that house ...

Mr. Steinschneider: To 150.

Chairman O'Reilly: ... because I think that would give us something better, or even some markers that would give us an idea of what the height is going to be.

Mr. Steinschneider: One quick comment on this is, Mitch Koch is the architect for 177 and was nice enough to actually share his construction documents with us. So we were able to actually construct the section that he has, I'd say, within a foot because there's always the chance that two surveyors don't have exactly the same stuff. But I'd say it's within a foot; that this is an exact profile cutting through the two.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, I think to your point, one thing we've frequently done in this case – and one of the slides showed sort of how the profile changes, the height profile changes, depending on where you start on the site – is to have this staked out so we can go and see it. Then also make a request to the person who wrote the letter to potentially visit their house and take a chance to see the views they're referring to.

Mr. Steinschneider: That would be very helpful to us.

Chairman O'Reilly: Is 177 occupied currently?

Mr. Steinschneider: 177 is not, but the builder is a builder I do a lot of work with so I'm sure I could make arrangements to get access to that and you'd be able to walk through it.

Boardmember Sullivan: But this is the letter from the person at 179.

Chairman O'Reilly: This is 179.

Boardmember Sullivan: It's not 177, so this would be ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: They're here.

Chairman O'Reilly: Oh, 177 is here? Oh, okay.

Male Voice: 179.

Chairman O'Reilly: You're 179, right .

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: 177 we approved.

Chairman O'Reilly: What?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: 177 is the house we approved that was the tear-down.

Chairman O'Reilly: No, no, no. That's 167 Pinecrest. We're talking about 177 Broadway. No, I'm just wondering if people are ...

Boardmember Sullivan: (Inaudible).

Chairman O'Reilly: We'll worry about that when we get to it, but I'm thinking if there's people that are buying that house, or they're there and away, they may not have seen it. So we'd be interested to hear from 177, I think.

Mr. Steinschneider: Sure.

Chairman O'Reilly: Kathleen, I interrupted you.

Boardmember Sullivan: No. I just was figuring out where we want to have the house staked, and then have a surveyor identify that those are the accurate measurements. Then letting us take a look from different places is very helpful. Because to your point, it's about the documentation that's never able to be accurate enough for these kinds of things. And it's a 3-dimensional issue.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: (Off-mic), as well?

Chairman O'Reilly: Hyde Park.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes. I think maybe four points of the house, or we'll figure something out that makes sense.

Mr. Steinschneider: So you're thinking of something at the site like balloons or posts or something?

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: Posts, with flags on top if you can.

Mr. Steinschneider: Right. Some of those at the west end might be scary, just how tall they would be. But the east end should be very easy to do.

Boardmember Sullivan: The ones on the west would be important 'cause that's going to show you the outer points.

Chairman O'Reilly: Where the actual front of the house will be.

Mr. Steinschneider: Well, front is the east side.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes.

Mr. Steinschneider: When you're up above, looking back, how far across. Yeah.

Male Voice: Maybe that's a balloon thing.

Mr. Steinschneider: That might be a balloon on a calm day. I've had too many balloon walks where the balloons are, "Ahh, the house is only 6 feet above the ground because that's where the balloon is."

Chairman O'Reilly: And on a cold day they deflate.

Boardmember Sullivan: Patrick, would it be helpful ... could you help us in kind of identifying those points? Because that's something we've always ...

Planning Consultant Cleary: I think we want to get the corners of the building, no doubt about it.

Boardmember Sullivan: But just maybe think about what may help us figure that out. Because I think sometimes we've said things and it's not been accurate enough or useful enough.

Chairman O'Reilly: And I think you said the drop in the land is 46 feet from the northwest to the southeast?

Planning Consultant Cleary: Something like that, yes.

Mr. Steinschneider: One quick clarification, too. When we were talking about a 2-foot cut,

it wasn't that we were concerned about our driveway getting too steep. What we'd like to do is actually re-grade ...

Planning Consultant Cleary: Transition to the existing driveway.

Mr. Steinschneider: Well, yeah. The driveway that's going back to 179 right now comes up over a hump and comes down to their garage. If we could cut 2 feet out of that, then we could drop the whole house 2 feet.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Right. Which goes to the question of are you allowed to do that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Does the easement allow you to do that?

Mr. Steinschneider: The way I would put it is, if the easement allows it that makes it a reasonable request. But I would still want to talk directly with the people because that doesn't mean they're going to be happy with that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, they're here.

Mr. Steinschneider: Well, we haven't met them yet.

Chairman O'Reilly: So I don't know whether you took the point – the elevation of 115 in comparison to the top level of the elevation there at 115 – in comparison to what you're proposing at Zero Pinecrest.

Mr. Steinschneider: Yep.

Chairman O'Reilly: Kathleen?

Boardmember Sullivan: Only ready for steep slopes, whenever you are.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay. Emily, questions on view preservation?

Boardmember Goldman: No, just a point that since the house, the design, has this really interesting, elegant, various roofline, four stakes just might be enough for the mockup.

Mr. Steinschneider: I think what would work for the mockup is, we've got the ridge coming across. And I think if we put two posts ...

Planning Consultant Cleary: And then something between the two.

Mr. Steinschneider: ... that did the ridge, and then we've got something on the west end so you could see that, that would be kind of the two worst case edges.

Planning Consultant Cleary: The challenge, Emily, is there may be a tree in the way. That you have to get out to the site to see how you can lay that out so you've got a reasonable view of what that mockup might be. So we'll work together to figure that out.

Mr. Steinschneider: Yeah. And the only way to do that – having tried to use tape measures and stuff – is have the surveyor come and say, Here's your benchmark, this is this point. And then we can do a ribbon on it and say that's exactly where it will be.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think the board would very much like to have the surveyor involved.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: They've had some problems in the past with inaccurate mockups.

Boardmember Sullivan: Correct.

Chairman O'Reilly: We have.

Boardmember Sullivan: All righty.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay?

Mr. Steinschneider: So then are you ready to approve it tonight?

[laughter]

Boardmember Sullivan: I doubt it.

Chairman O'Reilly: Sorry, do you have any questions?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Kerry, you have anything ...

Mr. Steinschneider: I think you've got questions from neighbors.

Village Attorney Whitehead: ... on view preservation?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: No. I mean, I'm anxious to hear what the public has to say.

Chairman O'Reilly: Steep slopes. Then look at the issue of steep slopes, which we heard from Paddy, and we've heard from Patrick. So, Kathy?

Boardmember Sullivan: This is probably the most challenging steep slopes I've seen because of the extensive slopes and the amount of disturbance. When you go from 25- to 75 percent of slopes over 25 percent, that's just an indication of an issue ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Yep.

Boardmember Sullivan: ... as you mentioned. And my reaction – actually, from looking at the drawings – when I went to the site, I couldn't believe sort of the extent of drop and sort of kind of a hollowing out of the site. I mean, it's just a real challenge.

I think, in retrospect, two issues of how this may impact the neighbors and the drainage situation. We'll stay with that for now. I think you need to look at upstream. I mean, that site is formed like a swale, it's formed like a place that water accumulates. I went to Greenburgh's GIS site, which has 2-foot topos, and it looks like there's stuff happening even up from Andrea's. So I need to look at that. Not that you have to tell us what you're going to do with that, but this site's sort of in the middle of some things.

Mr. Steinschneider: Absolutely, and we're aware of the exact same things. We looked at the same things, and it's one of the challenges if you look at steep slopes and the fact that it's really like there's a hole. Because what happens is, those contour lines that swing in on this lot, they actually come back out and swing this way. So what it really is a great big swale ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Right.

Mr. Steinschneider: ... that's taking everything from Broadway down.

Boardmember Sullivan: And you're filling it up.

Mr. Steinschneider: Right.

Boardmember Sullivan: You're filling it up with a house.

Mr. Steinschneider: Well, we're trying to ...

Boardmember Sullivan: But my point is that you're creating ...

Mr. Steinschneider: You have to show how that works.

Boardmember Sullivan: You have to deal with it.

Mr. Steinschneider: Yeah.,

Boardmember Sullivan: I think the other thing is that this is where how you impact the slopes comes into play. Because I think I would like to know how much fill you're bringing in to the site to accomplish what you're doing. When I looked at the survey and looked at your elevation points for your basement, your first floor, et cetera, I mean you start sailing above the ground very quickly. And actually, where your basement ends on the site is approximately 7 to 9 feet above natural grade.

So for me, I'm not sure how this house is fitting into the site when a basement level at the westernmost edge is ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Is full above ground.

Boardmember Sullivan: ... is that far above ground. So that's all fill where the first floor is, where the garage relates, all that sort of stuff. I think this house ... and the images are interesting that you showed from the clients because it sort of says it's a level kind of courtyard ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Sure.

Boardmember Sullivan: ... it has this stately house, this stately elevation. This site is not really a site that that ...

Mr. Steinschneider: It's a challenging site, no doubt.

Boardmember Sullivan: It works super well with that. I mean, I think the houses up on Broadway are interesting because most of those are entered on the upper floor and the other floors go below. I mean, you could flip your basement – I mean the first and second floors – enter on the top floor. You know, bedrooms on the second, basement, that type of thing. A suggestion: I mean, our steep slopes doesn't really talk about what that goal is. The comprehensive plan did talk about wanting architecture on steep slopes to be more fitting to the contours. I think this is a site to really explore that in many ways because it's very ... to have that kind of elevational (sic) change on the bottom floor ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Right.

Boardmember Sullivan: ... is dramatic. And I'm not sure. That, to me, is an issue with the steep slopes.

The other thing, I know you're challenged with the development coverage and the issue of having a driveway that you have to provide. But your court is sort of adding onto that issue, and I wonder if it would be a way to sort of minimize some additional development coverage; to potentially use that driveway easement as part of your turnaround space. Maybe have the garage doors face towards that. I know there's elevational (sic) issues, and maybe that's a good ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Elevationally (sic), I'm sure it could be made to work. The concern I have is that I actually have a house we did out in West Hampton where we did that. What ended up happening is, the people who lived behind felt like they were driving through the other people's property and the people who lived in front started feeling like they're driving on their property. So, you know, keeping it separate so that both are using the driveway – these cars go to that garage, these turn into a courtyard – it just means there's no cars going to be parked out in that area.

Boardmember Sullivan: But I just think it's something to explore ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Sure.

Boardmember Sullivan: ... because that would allow you to get rid of that amount of development coverage. Which is part of the thing that's already over, and you can maybe get within the parameters. It just looked like a potential way. And also, too, because it would make the front of the house be more like the rest of Pinecrest. Because that was one of your goals, where people walk up to a front yard and ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Well, that would probably pull the house up further to the east, which would actually mean it would go forward. You'd look down Pinecrest and you'd see that at that point you'd probably change the house to be seen in the front. You wouldn't want to really see the side of the house. I think that would be unfortunate. So it would just be a different concept.

Boardmember Sullivan: Just a thought, a suggestion.

I think that's about it. Buddy, I apologize in advance for doing this but I couldn't help it: I think the grade calculations need a look at, at how it got calculated, to determine whether the basement's a story. I looked at it, and I think it was calculated ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: We looked at it and seemed to be ...

Boardmember Sullivan: It seemed okay? It's close.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Oh, it's close. He was to the good.

Boardmember Sullivan: Okay, all right.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yes, I did check that.

Boardmember Sullivan: Okay, I'm not sure that's what I looked at, but that's a secondary issue. I think that's really it. It's just, I think, trying to figure out a way to make this house maybe be more contouring to the slope itself. That's what my question about the fill is because how much fill you're going to be bringing in is maybe something you want to mitigate, or talk about.

Mr. Steinschneider: Yep. I mean, I'm always trying to work to cut fill balance, and this site challenges that.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right.

Chairman O'Reilly: Are you cutting into the hill at any point?

Mr. Steinschneider: We are, but not anywhere near sufficient to get that cut filled to be zero. You know, we would be bringing material in. It's not a bad time to be doing that right now. The problem is, anybody who's got any clean, good fill trying to get rid of it. But that just means it's not difficult getting it. Bringing the fill in means trucks.

Years ago we had somebody who was interested in doing a house on Pinecrest and they were interested in doing a modular. We had done a couple modulars in Dobbs. And we just said maybe, with a helicopter. You know, trying to get that in off of Broadway coming down or coming up from Warburton, you can't do it. So big trucks coming in is not a desirable thing.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes. I'm going to the right. Emily, on the steep slope? You're okay? Kerry?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I'm with Kathy. Like I just think the design ... this is a super-challenging site. I mean, I'm someone ... I live on probably one of the steepest slopes in town in a very old house. And as Kathy's saying, my house is I walk in at street level and, you know, you go down to the bedrooms and you go ... I just feel like building up from that front street level and having all that fill down below the basement you'd need an architecture and a design that's more compatible with this site.

I mean, this is not an easy site even if you were using ... I mean, number one, the house is fairly large for the site I think. I mean, there are thoughts of can it be smaller, and that will address some of your coverage issues.

Mr. Steinschneider: All things that I'm sure my client and I will be talking about. I'm not going to put them on the spot now to ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Right. No, I'm just saying that in my opinion that's a consideration.

Mr. Steinschneider: Right. And the point, that's why I put this together. It's not like somebody came in and we cavalierly said, Oh, we'll just do this. The challenge is to find lots these days to build on. I was lucky enough to have tons of them at one point, but they're all gone. So right now, when you're finding a building lot, it's usually a piece of property that no one built on for 20, 30, 40 years because it was so challenging. But those are the ones we're getting now, and they can result in really great houses.

But as you've said, getting the house to work with it is a challenge. What I liked about the client's approach was the integrity and concept of their vision. You know, my goal was to try and see if I can make that work. Technically I know we can, but does that make it work the way it should. That's what we're talking about.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yes. I mean, it's a lot of disturbance.

Mr. Steinschneider: Right.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Like it's hard to wrap my head around that much disturbance. It's definitely, in my eight years on the board, probably the most high level of disturbance I've seen.

Mr. Steinschneider: I don't know if you know of our firm, but we often are involved in the projects that ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I do. My sister lived in Wit's End.

Mr. Steinschneider: Did she really?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yes, she did. So I am familiar

Mr. Steinschneider: Which house? I mean, which unit?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Look ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Okay, we'll talk later.

Chairman O'Reilly: Talk later, yes.

Mr. Steinschneider: So yes, that was a project where they were tearing that building down. And we said, Oh, no, we'll buy it, we'll fix it up. Aptly named for the developer.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And that's what I'm saying. You know, the lot and the house and the architecture need to come together in a way that's reasonable ...

Mr. Steinschneider: Right, agreed.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: ... and I'm going to leave it at that, I think. There's a lot of work ahead would be my feeling.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, I do agree. I know 67 Pinecrest was a steep slopes issue, and that was one to work out for a while. Nothing like this one, though. At least they had the area and everything there. But it is a continued issue, and obviously you've got some things which have been suggested which need to be done. But I would like to hear any public comment, whether it's from the current owners.

And this is 179. If you'd come up please, introduce yourself and your address.

Tamar Hassan, 179 Broadway: This good?

Chairman O'Reilly: That's good.

Mr. Hassan: Good evening.

Mr. Hassan: I live on Broadway with my wife, Katie, and our three children. We are the current owners of the property.

Our primary concern, as we've stated in the letter, is with view preservation and impact of property value. We feel that there's a really direct impact to the views of the home, from multiple parts of the home, including the master bedroom and three other bedrooms as well as the kitchen and the main living area and an outer deck, as well as a patio in the backyard.

When we purchased this home, one of the main reasons we bought it was because of the views. And it's one of the primary reasons we paid the price we paid for it, as well as the fact that it was in a view preservation district. We've included details in our letter. And we're happy to submit more information to the board and also to the purchasers of the property in any way that we can help; open, invite to take pictures from the home and any part of the home, and however else.

Chairman O'Reilly: We may want to call on you.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think so. We'd like to call on you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes. You're fairly recent, right? Purchased recently?

Mr. Hassan: July.

Chairman O'Reilly: July, I thought so. Anyone else? Yes.

Leah Rossner, 115 Pinecrest Parkway: I purchased my property in 1977 under the distinct impression that it was the last house on Pinecrest Parkway. So to have another house be built that has no frontage on Pinecrest Parkway is more than disturbing. In addition to the fact that it feels like my property will totally be compromised in terms of the privacy we have and cars going past our home into another house.

Also I'm concerned about we've had erosion on our slope where we have a storm drain that's underneath the slope on the north side of our property. You know, we're only the second family that's lived in this home since it was built, okay? So we've done a lot of work on the house. When we originally bought the house we had a water problem in the basement and installed French drains. Well, a few years ago there was erosion on the hill such that the storm drain was broken underneath the surface and came up through the soil on the north side of my property. My homeowners insurance and the Village of Hastings was not willing to take any responsibility for the repairs that were necessary.

So they fixed that pipe, but in the meantime I had to redo the France drains because I got water in my basement again. And also I was using the garage level of my house for storage, and everything on that level that was being stored there was ruined. That was all at my expense. So I'm extremely concerned that with this steep slope situation that I don't even know what to anticipate could go wrong on my property. But I'm concerned that something could go wrong and that nobody other than myself will be willing to take financial responsibility for that.

So I have a lot of concerns.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, thank you. Do we have any other comments?

Well, we're not making any decisions tonight, therefore I don't have to ask for a motion.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I was going to say it would be great if we can contact ... I mean, I do think a site visit ...

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, we do have the address.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: ... to work with you to get in the house.

Chairman O'Reilly: If you can give your information to Buddy.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: (Cross-talk).

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right, but you should get their contact information so that once it's up ...

Boardmember Sullivan: And also the woman who's to the south.

Chairman O'Reilly: And to the south, yes.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: But I do think a site visit and the mockup will help.

Chairman O'Reilly: The woman who spoke last, would you also give your contact information to Buddy? That's Buddy.

Boardmember Sullivan: So we can maybe have a site visit to your house and see ...

Chairman O'Reilly: I think we also should find out about 177.

Male Voice: (Off-mic).

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, if Mitch is the architect you can contact Mitch.

Planning Consultant Cleary: He can track down the owner.

Chairman O'Reilly: The owner, yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I'm sure Mitch can do that. And they're not living there currently. It's under construction.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes. So I think ...

Planning Consultant Cleary: We adjourn.

Chairman O'Reilly: You have your homework.

Mr. Steinschneider: We have our homework. It's a good list. We might have it done by the

end of the weekend, but we'll try.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, thanks very much.

Mr. Steinschneider: Thank you.

VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS – None

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting Date – February 20, 2020

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman O'Reilly: Do we have any other business? I think not, therefore I ask for a motion to adjourn.

On MOTION of Boardmember Sullivan, SECONDED by Boardmember Goldman, with a voice vote of all in favor Chairman O'Reilly adjourned the Regular Meeting.