

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
JUNE 21, 2018**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday June 21, 2018 at 8:15 p.m. in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

PRESENT: Chairperson Kathleen Sullivan, Boardmember Eva Alligood (9:25 p.m. arrival), Boardmember William O'Reilly, Boardmember Richard Bass, Alternate Boardmember Richard Martin, Boardmember Kerry Gould-Schmit (8:25 p.m. arrival), Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, and Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr.

Chairperson Sullivan: Good evening. Welcome to the Planning Board of Hastings-on-Hudson. This is our Thursday, June 21, 2018 meeting. May I have the roll call, please?

I. ROLL CALL

Village Attorney Whitehead: Buddy, if either Michael or Kerry come in, just make sure you mark down ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: I'll mark then down.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, when they come in.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I gotcha.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of May 17, 2018

Chairperson Sullivan: All right, next item is up is approval of the meeting minutes from our May 17, 2018 meeting. Does anyone have any comments?

Boardmember O'Reilly: I don't.

Boardmember Bass: No, I'm good.

Chairperson Sullivan: I have none either. We cannot vote, however, because we don't have a quorum until other people come that were here. Because you were not here.

Boardmember Martin: I was not here.

Chairperson Sullivan: So we'll have to put that off.

Village Attorney Whitehead: 'Til later.

Chairperson Sullivan: All right, next item up we have a handful of new public hearings. The first up is a site plan approval application of David Jackowe.

III. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Site Plan Approval – Application of David Jackowe for the documentation of the installation of a cow sculpture on the roof of his mixed-use building located at 5 Spring Street. Said property is in the CC Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-22-32 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairperson Sullivan: Would someone like to come up and present the project to us? And if you wouldn't mind, your name and address, please.

David Jackowe, applicant: I live at 5 Spring Street in Hastings. What can I tell you about my project?

Boardmember O'Reilly: Why? Why do you want a cow on the roof?

Mr. Jackowe: Why not? I happen to have one. I happen to have a cow and a roof, and it seemed like a good fit.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Do you have anything else?

Mr. Jackowe: I'm sorry?

Boardmember O'Reilly: Do you have anything else?

Mr. Jackowe: Any other animals?

Mr. Jackowe: I only have cows.

Boardmember Bass: The cow is from New York City's display?

Mr. Jackowe: Supposedly. That's what my father said. You know, more seriously I thought

this would be a good addition to the building and a good addition to downtown. I think it's an interesting piece, I think it speaks to the Farmers' Market, and I think it's the right place for it on the top of my roof.

Boardmember Bass: I'm struck full of questions. There's going to be more to Buddy. It's heavy, we get good winds, how is it attached to the roof and what's the guarantees that's it's not going to ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Well, it's only temporarily attached to the roof right now. It's going to have to be permanently affixed to the roof and it's going to have to be certified by a registered architect or a licensed engineer because it does have to meet wind shear for our region ...

Boardmember Bass: Right.

Building Inspector Minozzi: ... which is, I think, 110 miles an hour. So that's going to have to be dealt with during building permit procedures. It has to meet minimum state code so it's safe.

Boardmember Bass: So how is it attached now, and what's your insurance coverage?

Mr. Jackowe: The way this is attached now – I think I submitted some pictures you can take a look at it – the cow's affixed ... well, first of all I had help installing this from a company called Schultz Fabrication. I had them write me a letter also. I don't know if you'd like to see a copy of this letter. I could show it to you.

Boardmember Bass: We assume you had help, unless you're very strong.

Mr. Jackowe: This discusses the anchors. I have some other pictures that show the internal mechanism of the anchoring system also. Here, I'll show you these, too.

Chairperson Sullivan: I'd like to ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: Are these the ones we got?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes. I think Buddy is saying that the anchoring system is going to have to be improved. And it may need to be shifted a little just for building code compliance. And you're probably going to need something from an engineer or somebody saying that it will meet ... because it's a wind velocity area so you're going to need something to show that it will meet those requirements.

Mr. Jackowe: So what you're saying is I'll need a letter, signed ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: We'll deal with the that during the building permit certification.

Chairperson Sullivan: I'd like to not necessarily just talk about how it's attached to the building, but let's talk about it being *on* the building.

Boardmember O'Reilly: What?

Chairperson Sullivan: This particular sculpture and the start of having sculptures being put on top of our buildings in our downtown area. I mean, there's an issue, I think, of does it fit into the character of the downtown; there's others that might come, we might have more cow friends up there or other animals or more art-like sculptures. Not that that is an art, but something that's more abstract. Any thoughts about that?

Boardmember O'Reilly: I think it's a good point.

Boardmember Bass: Again, I didn't study art or how it's addressed in the code, but I think it's silent. We're taking it as a structure so we don't deal with it as an art piece. So we would have to regulate it, or evaluate it, for structural reasons. Not for artistic reasons.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's not just structural. I mean, you're evaluating it based on the site plan criteria in your code.

Chairperson Sullivan: Which is, does it fit into the character of the downtown?

Boardmember Bass: Okay.

Chairperson Sullivan: I mean, I was joking with our new boardmember. But it was sort of like, you know, parking: no, there's no parking – we don't deal with parking with the cow. The cow's okay with that. But, you know, how does it fit into the character of the downtown.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I have the ARB minutes, and when they came to the ARB two weeks ago – a couple weeks ago – the ARB felt that the application was appropriate with regard to scale and character, but not as what it is. Because they would not comment on a piece of artwork. So they tried to break it out as it was just the structural end of it.

Chairperson Sullivan: Just as a physical thing.

Building Inspector Minozzi: That's why they specifically said "scale and character."

Boardmember Bass: Right. So on that note – and, again, I'm trying not to be whimsical about this – I kind of like it, it's different, I think it's appropriate. Would I want to see a cow on every roof? No. But do we have the ability to evaluate it if we took it to the extreme?

Chairperson Sullivan: I guess my feeling about it is, you know, we're just starting to talk about different types of things being put on our roofs in the downtown. I mean, the gentleman at Hastings House is an example of that when we get to that, you know, putting a use up on top of it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Can you speak up, Kathy?

Chairperson Sullivan: Sure. I see this a little bit as a ... I don't know how appropriate it is to have this kind of thing visible from the street. Because one of the concerns on Hastings House was to try to keep some of that activity not really as part of people's perception when they're on the street. I mean, having a piece of art, a sculpture, you want to show it off.

I mean, I wish you could find a place on the ground for it, to be honest with you, rather than up on the roof. I know it was at your parents' home for many years and people would walk by and get to enjoy it. I've heard people talk about it, wondering where it went, because it was really sort of significant, especially for the kids.

That would be my hope. Is there another place for it where it could be part of the community?

Mr. Jackowe: I think the rooftop is *the* most appropriate place. I think it suits the community. You know, Hastings calls itself – or likes to call itself – a community of artists. So I think that people displaying artwork would be in line with the Village's image of itself.

I think the rooftop is *the* most appropriate place. I'm not establishing a precedent here. I think *this* building established a precedent with a rooftop adornment, and those are the cell phone towers.

Chairperson Sullivan: You know, I saw you quoted saying that and it's interesting. Linda can speak to it, but we have a lot of requirements when it comes to the communications industry and sometimes don't have a lot of say on where things go. So just ...

Mr. Jackowe: But just from an aesthetic standpoint, I mean if we're going to judge the aesthetics of something I think we have to look at what's on the Municipal Building also in terms of rooftop adornment.

Chairperson Sullivan: I would say we didn't have a choice with that, but we're limited in our ability to change what gets put on that roof, at times.

Boardmember Bass: So I have a question. Getting off the issue of art/non-art, why this wasn't submit to view preservation..

Building Inspector Minozzi: Forgot to report on that, I'm sorry. This received a view

preservation waiver ...

Boardmember Bass: Okay.

Building Inspector Minozzi: ... on both the planning chair and the zoning chair.

Chairperson Sullivan: From Matt and myself.

Boardmember Bass: That's fine. Kathy, I hear your concerns. Only because I've played with art, with buildings, I kind of think it's appropriate, whimsical, will add to the Village. My only concern is securing it, and you must have more insurance because if that thing falls off onto your neighbor ... did you seek additional insurance from your carrier?

Mr. Jackowe: I'm looking into it. It's something I'm looking into.

Chairperson Sullivan: Kerry, you've joined us. Do you have anything to add?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I mean, I'm sort of following suit with Richard. I feel like it's not completely out of context. I think we definitely need to make sure it is compliant with anything the Building Department wants. I think it's a hard road to walk – aesthetics, art. I mean, I think if you have a separate program like they do in the city that's one thing. I would just view it as being treated like any other rooftop element. And I do think it fits within the Village proper.

Chairperson Sullivan: Any comments?

Boardmember Martin: Yes, I would agree with that. I'm new to this. I can't say that it's not appropriate, but I feel that it's not inappropriate. My only concern is that we might be opening the door to anybody putting whatever they want on the roofs. So if we could approve it as a one-time, any future thing needs to come to us also so we don't just open the door for anybody or anything to go on roofs.

Chairperson Sullivan: Open the barn door.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And that is my presumption. That they would still have ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Anything would still have to come before you.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And we would have the option to say ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: You'd have to make the same determination.

Boardmember Bass: But we have to be very careful ...

Chairperson Sullivan: Right.

Boardmember Bass: ... because we're looking at it as a structure, not as art. Because when we get into art is where you start crossing some lines.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Objective, right.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Which were the exact feelings of the ARB.

Chairperson Sullivan: I would like, if you wouldn't mind, letting people from the public speak.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Does Bill get to talk?

Chairperson Sullivan: Well, Bill, I'm sorry.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I'm still on the whimsical. Accuse me of having no sense of humor, but if you have a cow on the roof it just sounds funny to me. Whether it's art or not is another matter. The question of I have trouble putting a cow on the roof in the context of appropriate, I'll put it as whimsical. I'm not sure I'll put it down as appropriate. I mean, the first time I saw it I was walking along Maple Avenue and I thought what the heck was that. I thought somebody was moving. Just as a joke.

Now, if you want to say it'll become a talking point in the Village of Hastings I think we probably have that lined up. The question is – the reason I started out the conversation of why – it's almost as if ... I think your answer was "Why not? – I have nowhere else to put it," something. So I don't know whether we want somebody saying, Well, I got nowhere else to put it, I'll put something on the roof. It just strikes me as an odd place to put a cow, that's all.

Mr. Jackowe: Can I just say that that's exactly why I put it on the roof.

Boardmember O'Reilly: So I'd say that?

Mr. Jackowe: Yeah, because it's an odd place that you don't expect it. That's what I think makes it interesting.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Right. But I do wonder if we're going to have people wondering, Well, what can I put on my roof? Now, if we're going to be inundated with people wanting to put things on their roof we're opening up something which is going to be totally different. You may establish a new pattern here for rooftop adornments, so ...

Mr. Jackowe: Sleights, reindeers? People put *them* on their roof.

Boardmember O'Reilly: And they take them down. But is this a fixture that's going to be there for a while?

Mr. Jackowe: So if I took this down would it not be a structure then? No, I mean if I put a time limit on how long it's going to be up there would it not be a structure? Would it be considered ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: No. You referred to reindeers. I mean, obviously reindeers (sic) come down at the end of the season. You know, if we put them up there for Christmas we take them down. This cow's going to be up there from now until you decide to take it out.

Boardmember Bass: (Unintelligible) reindeer for a couple of years.

Boardmember O'Reilly: It's only what I'm wondering about. That's fine. Random thoughts.

Boardmember Bass: Madam Chair, I have to disclose that I milk cows for six months of my life so I'm biased towards cows.

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you for sharing that.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I have a second question. I mean, what is the ruling if I have a front yard ... I mean, because certainly there's people with large sculptures in the front yards, and I'm just not sure. We've never, since my time on the Board, ever dealt with one.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But you don't really deal with single-family ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Well, that's true. I wasn't sure. Well, I guess if it was a view preservation issue.

Building Inspector Minozzi: The only issue is like the giraffe on Flower Avenue ...

Chairperson Sullivan: The giraffes.

Building Inspector Minozzi: ... had to come before view preservation. Not as an artwork, but as a ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Structure.

Building Inspector Minozzi: ... structure, in a front yard, that could potentially block ... in today's world it would have got a waiver, but back then it had to go through full view preservation approval.

Village Attorney Whitehead: There was no waiver process yet.

Building Inspector Minozzi: There was not a waiver process back then. You could look at it as a structure on a house, but we did have to look at it as view preservation because it is a structure.

Chairperson Sullivan: I'm convinced. I understand the argument now from the boardmembers. I mean, my disclosure is my mother used to collect cows. And I grew up with a lion sculpture in my backyard so I kind of appreciate where you're at for both things. Taking things that were significant to your family and using them, and then also having something that's like a fun element for people. But I really wish it could be on the ground. That's just the only thing I'll say.

People from the public like to speak, please come up, say your name and address.

Marjorie Apel, 111 Rosedale Avenue: I don't come to meetings much anymore, but when I saw this I got very excited. I sent the description off to my grown daughters who live in different places, and we're very excited. One said, Very Californian, and the other one said, Very artistic, go, it's really great.

I don't know if you remember, but a number of years ago Chicago had cows all over the place. They had an art contest, they took cows and you had to paint them, and they put them all over the place. They attached them on the top of buildings, on the sides of buildings. And we know how windy that is. It was a great success. It drew people to Chicago. I think it wasn't permanent. Some are still there because they auctioned them off. Then some other communities decided to do, I don't know, pigs or sheep (sic) or something like that.

So I thought of that when I read this, and I said that this is something that really fits Hastings. We are artistic, we have a good sense of humor. I believe we still have an art committee that would look over and decide whether we want to do cows or sheep or whatever else we want to do. They can certainly look at that. And I want to commend this person for being creative of what he wants to do with his sculpture, whether it's a cow or whatever else he was doing. I'm sure that the engineers from Chicago can come and take a look and give us advice of how to put them on the tops of buildings or sides of buildings. It doesn't mean there's going to be a rush to have things all over the place.

Certainly we can refer anybody else who wants to put something up to the art committee and have a discussion whether is this something that we want to do and move forward in doing. But in the meantime, I am very much in favor of David's proposal if he can get it up there – I mean, it's up there – and make sure it doesn't fall down. I mean, it didn't fall down in Chicago so I don't think it's going to fall down here. And I'm glad that you're considering it, and I hope we move forward with it. Thank you.

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you very much. Anyone else like to speak to this application?

Okay, so any other comments from the Board? May I have a motion?

On MOTION of Boardmember Bass, SECONDED by Boardmember Gould-Schmit, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved to grant site plan approval to David Jackowe for the documentation of the installation of a cow sculpture on the roof of his mixed-use building located at 5 Spring Street.

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you very much.

Boardmember Bass: Don't let it fall.

Chairperson Sullivan: All right, next up is a view preservation advisory application of Danielle Steiner and Mark Christie.

2. **View Preservation Advisory - Application of Danielle Steiner & Mark Christie for the construction of a rear addition on their single-family dwelling at 181 Washington Avenue. Said property is located in the MR-1.5 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.70-53-1.1 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairperson Sullivan: We've gotten a variety of e-mails that have been sent in favor of this application. I will not read them, but we will have them be part of our records. They have come from neighbors who are close to this particular property who have viewed the drawings and say they are in favor of the change.

This is from Sam Mansour and Kayo Okawa. The next one is from the Foxman family, directly across the street on Washington Avenue, also feeling it will improve our neighborhood and the river view of the Aqueduct because of some of the changes that they're making to the structure. And someone who lives at the ... Eric and Mayu Frank, who live at 27 William Street. Also I believe it looks like their backyard neighbors, but they also feel that they have no concerns and they support the project. So those are just some things that have come in.

Can you please say your name and address?

Jill Anderson, Baldwin & Franklin Architects: We're the architects for 181 Washington Avenue. This is a view looking south – I'm sorry, looking north. As you go up the hill, 181 is on the corner of Aqueduct Lane. We are proposing the small addition at the rear which has

a balcony on top, which has a railing around it. The next photograph you'll see is the area of the Aqueduct we're talking about, which is basically a parking lot on the Aqueduct. Aqueduct Lane runs parallel with it so people walk both on the lane and on the Aqueduct, and 181 is the little white house.

The next photograph will show the plans that we are proposing, and that are existing. The owners are Mark Christie here and Danielle Steiner and their daughter. This house is very small; it's 17 feet by 26 feet. The existing layout is difficult to live in because there's a kitchen and bathroom in the basement, living and dining room on the first floor, and two bedrooms on the top floor. What we are trying to do is to make the kitchen, and the living room and small dining area, all on the first floor. In order to achieve this we are going to reduce the porch area and take the two sides out so we still have a symmetrical little porch like the original house, and add a small addition at the rear.

The next board will show that none of the neighboring properties have their view impacted at all by this addition because it's not within the area where you look towards the river. So you have received letters from all the houses that are around here and look at number 181 and the new addition.

I apologize for the submission you had ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: You got to speak right into the microphone.

Ms. Anderson: I'm sorry. Because we thought we would get a waiver, and took photographs during the winter which these are, Buddy rightly pointed out that there was a sliver of the Palisades that will be impacted. Our photographs were then taken in the summer so there are leaves on the trees and you can't really see what's happening.

So in the next photograph, one of these photographs blown up shows the red-roofed house. Just above it is a tiny sliver of Palisades which will be blocked by the addition.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I had asked if the applicant would do a mockup ...

Ms. Anderson: The next photograph.

Building Inspector Minozzi: ... and then when they first came in for a waiver I asked them to do a markup. And they did, and that's when I went by and saw that there was just the smallest amount that was affected. So we had to send them for full approval.

Chairperson Sullivan: Frankly, I know from talking with the chair of the Zoning Board I think we both would feel comfortable letting the neighbors have a chance to know about this and letting that process fold out. So, I mean, we can talk about how significant the impact is,

but that's, I think – waiver or not – it's important to get the commentary.

Ms. Anderson: Absolutely, yes. Yes, they needed to know.

This is the Bamboo mockup. You will see it's two stories, and then there's a place at the top where the ... that's where the railing would be.

Chairperson Sullivan: I see.

Ms. Anderson: And that little area above the red roof is where the Palisades are visible in the winter from Aqueduct Lane and the Aqueduct.

In the next photograph, this is the front porch intact. And on the left-hand side you can see that it impedes the view of the river and the Palisades. In the next photograph, we have demolished the porch and there is now an increased view of the river and the Palisades both in winter and in the summer.

The next board shows the areas. If you're walking along the Aqueduct, zone A is where you will have the Palisades obstructed by the addition. And then in zone B, if you walk along the Aqueduct in that area the view is increased by making the porch smaller. Zone C, on the other side of the house, there's a little bit of an increase as well in the view, with the porch having been removed.

Chairperson Sullivan: Okay.

Ms. Anderson: We are slightly reducing the footprint of the house if we complete this work.

Chairperson Sullivan: All right, thank you very much.

Bill, any questions, comments?

Boardmember O'Reilly: No.

Chairperson Sullivan: Richard?

Boardmember Bass: No, I know the building well and I agree with her presentation.

Chairperson Sullivan: I was surprised you were taking away the front porch, but it makes the plan much nicer.

Ms. Anderson: Yes, yes.

Chairperson Sullivan: Small, but significant, changes.

Ms. Anderson: It's more in keeping with the original house, which had an open porch, and also gives you a little bit more distance from the road, a little bit more privacy.

Chairperson Sullivan: I think the sliver that you're talking about giving up has got a lot of other buildings around it. And what you're actually providing now is a very nice sort of sliver of the Palisades so I think it's an advantage for view preservation in some ways.

Ms. Anderson: Good.

Chairperson Sullivan: Anyone from the public like to speak to this application? We've had a lot of e-mails.

If not, may I have a motion to refer the view preservation to the Zoning Board?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Recommend.

Chairperson Sullivan: Recommend.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Recommend.

On MOTION of Boardmember Gould-Schmit, SECONDED by Boardmember O'Reilly, with a voice vote of all in, favor the Board resolved to approve the view preservation advisory for the application of Danielle Steiner & Mark Christie for the construction of a rear addition on their single-family dwelling at 181 Washington Avenue.

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you very much. Enjoy your house.

Danielle Steiner, applicant: Thank you.

Chairperson Sullivan: Last up of the new public hearings, we have a steep slopes approval, the application of Yakov Bindler.

3. **Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Yakov Bindler for a 252 square foot addition to an existing side yard deck at their single-family dwelling located at 41 Jefferson Avenue. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.80-74-7 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairperson Sullivan: We've gotten some information from our engineer?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes, I have some information. The applicant and his design team couldn't make it here tonight, but I told him it really didn't matter because they're in the middle of dealing with Hahn on the drainage and doing some CULTEC and such, as you all have the application here. So I told him don't go crazy, you're going to have to come back next month anyway with all the revisions to Hahn's comments. So I just kind of put his mind at rest about being here tonight. I hope that is okay with the Board.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So we're just basically ... you want the Board to just adjourn it. You should see if anybody's here to speak on it, since it was on the agenda.

Chairperson Sullivan: Right. I guess, too, also any comments on Hahn's memo from anyone. Any comments on the information we received from Hahn, any questions or anything?

Please come up if you'd like to speak to this application, say your name and address.

Eva Bouhassira, 50 Hamilton Avenue: Good evening.

Chairperson Sullivan: Please use the mic, Eva.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Just make sure the mic's in front of you.

Ms. Bouhassira: Yes. I wasn't aware that the applicants weren't actually being present tonight. So I'm not sure what the delay is and what the comments are, but I guess I could ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Just stop down, we'll show you.

Ms. Bouhassira: Okay.

Building Inspector Minozzi: There's stuff down at the office.

Ms. Bouhassira: Is it something that has to do with the structural engineering or site engineering or ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: It's all about site and drainage.

Ms. Bouhassira: Okay, that's interesting. That's exactly what I came to comment on. So should I make my comments, or should I ... all right, okay.

I'm the site immediately to the west of this property. In other words, a site below this house. So talking about the steep slopes and the drainage, the property's at the top of the steep slope, we are at the bottom of the steep slope. Now, it's wonderful to see that our neighbors are extending their deck and they are getting a better outdoor space. I have no problem with it of

any sort.

I did look at the submission online and I was a little surprised to see the drainage solution. So I made some notes on what they are proposing. You know, in a nutshell, I am going to say a couple things. One is that this area is very ... it's in a very natural state. This happens along the block. If you are somewhere between Jefferson and Hamilton it's almost as if you were in Hillside Woods. It's very untouched. The reason for that is that the slopes are so steep that they are hardly usable. It's nice to have a little bit of natural area left in the Village.

Obviously, having a hilly property is very common in the Village. It's not a problem to be at the bottom of the hill; in fact, we are above the neighbors across the street. So this is all standard. The question is, once you start doing improvements to a situation like that how do you engineer that? So I don't know if this proposal will change or not.

The second thing I'm going to say is that the area, as far as I understand, used to be a stone quarry. So the terrain is rock, and if you walk there you can see there is a lot of outcroppings and there is a lot of rocky soil. If you look at the drawings, there is a section of the house that says that there is a rock outcropping on A-400. In a section, it shows there is a rock outcropping. The same thing happens at our house. The back of our house is built over a crawl space which is a rock outcropping. Having been in this house for 12 years, we know that when it rains the water happens in this rocky crawl space. It's both surface water and water that probably is making its way through the layers of the rock and is basically an underground water. We have a sump pump installed to deal with that when major storms happen. So ...

Chairperson Sullivan: May I interrupt for just a second? So your concerns are on the fact that the water, the storm water's, going to be not managed in a way that's going to impact you?

Ms. Bouhassira: Yeah, so I'm just about getting to that. Okay, so when I saw the proposal I noticed that the engineering firm is suggesting a series of rechargers which happen down the hill from the proposed covered deck ...

Chairperson Sullivan: Right.

Ms. Bouhassira: ... because the deck is not only being expanded but it is also having a roof added on top of that. Which I'm not quite sure what's the purpose of that. I don't know if it's intended to be a screened porch and the screening is not shown, or if it's supposed to be an open deck with a roof.

Chairperson Sullivan: Well, for us, it actually was interesting because we've been looking at decks. And decks themselves are disturbing a very small piece of steep slopes.

Ms. Bouhassira: Yes.

Chairperson Sullivan: However, this has – like you say – a covered roof.

Ms. Bouhassira: Right.

Chairperson Sullivan: I would just suggest, are you headed towards the fact that the CULTECs might not work in this rock? I mean, I just would love to get to ...

Ms. Bouhassira: Yes, yes, I'm getting to it. So in other words, if the roof was on there the rainwater would be coming right through the deck and it would get disseminated somewhere in the area of the deck. However, because of the roof all the water is being collected to one particular corner of the roof and then it's being conducted to the CULTEC. And, you know, interestingly, if you look at this section you see that the water makes its way from about 288 feet elevation to about 258 feet elevation. In other words, there's a 30-foot long drop of the leader that collects the water from the roof to the grade.

Then when the leader hits the grade, there's another 15 feet drop to 243 feet elevation to get to the rechargers. Altogether, the water comes down 45 feet in height to get to the rechargers. The rechargers are 16 feet, which is a lot, you know. For 45 feet for a water pipe on a single-family house, that's a little odd. Then what happens is, the rechargers are shown in the engineering drawings as ... there's a section that shows what happens. And as you can see, they are planned to be recessed below the grade.

So back to the point. This is a very rocky area. When it rains, the water just runs down that hill because it's so rocky it has nowhere to go. So to imagine that it will be easy to recess these recharges, to me, is highly optimistic. And, in fact, if you look through the comments the engineers seem to be aware of the situation because they repeatedly say that the footings for this deck will have to be pinned to the rock. It's several times they mention, they show, the details on the drawings. So everybody knows there's rock, footings that will have to be pinned. And there is no depth to this rock. So ...

Chairperson Sullivan: I think our engineer's reviewing this and has come up with comments. The Village has an engineer who's reviewed the drawings that we received for tonight's meeting.

Ms. Bouhassira: Okay.

Chairperson Sullivan: There's a memo that's come back, and his review. And like Buddy started out saying, the design team has to take those changes, or requests, into consideration. Thank you for your points. I think we'll make sure that they get sent to Hahn if you ...

Ms. Bouhassira: I'd like to complete my comments with another note, please. So since this seems to be a solution which would accumulate a large amount of water near the property, and then it would release it very close to our house; which I brought some pictures, or if you have walked the property you know that our house is very low, it has sort of a swale behind it, and all that water is coming down. So it is what it is – it's hail, it's rain, it's fine – but now we're changing it and engineering it.

So what I would like to point out is that even though it seems to make some sense to take the water and run it down the hill, what's happening on this property is that here's the house, this is down the hill. And so the proposal says here's the covered roof, we're going to run the water down here where our house happens to sit. However, due to the configuration of the site the area of the site that is below the level of the deck starts here. So even if you went with the water in this direction you would still be below the level of the deck.

There is a house here that is far away, there is no structures. You can see that on the Google Maps picture that was submitted. So what I would like to do is to object to the location of these rechargers, and I would like to request that they are placed in this area where they are far away from our house and the neighbor's house, where they can still function in the same way without, you know, causing problems down the rock.

I'm just going to show you the idea on the section and then I'll be done with my comments. So if the Village is doing a review, perhaps that is something that could be discussed. So if you look at this section, you know, again the design right now brings the water down here, okay? Here's the deck, and here's an area that is well below the deck. And there is no reason why this water from this roof couldn't come here and there could be a drywell or rechargers or some sort of a less off-the-shelf – and more, you know, custom-built – solution that could absorb the water with here without sending it down the hill and into the vicinity of our house.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Could I make a recommendation?

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes, please.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Eva, why don't you write up to me what your ideas are ...

Ms. Bouhassira: Okay.

Building Inspector Minozzi: ... and I can propose that. I can send it along to our engineer as food for thought instead. Because no one's ... our engineer is not here, their engineer is not here, to address your concern. And not to ...

Ms. Bouhassira: Yes, I understand. Makes sense. I was hoping their engineer would be here so I could be addressing it, yes.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Well, I can send your comments to both their engineer and our engineer.

Ms. Bouhassira: Okay, perfect. I'm happy to write it down.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I think it would be much better to attack it that way.

Ms. Bouhassira: Sure, I'm happy to do a written version of this.

Chairperson Sullivan: Something like that is wonderful. I mean, I know Eva, and I respect her knowledge of this stuff so I was only trying to get all the points out there.

Ms. Bouhassira: Yes.

Boardmember O'Reilly: It's on the record.

Chairperson Sullivan: Well, but getting it, I think it would be helpful to show it to Hahn and the other engineer ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Absolutely.

Chairperson Sullivan: ... and see where it goes.

Boardmember Bass: Buddy, can I give her my comments?

Ms. Bouhassira: And in closing, I'd like to say there's a whole lot of trees in this area.

Chairperson Sullivan: Use your mic, please.

Ms. Bouhassira: In closing, I'd like to say there's a whole lot of trees in this area and any work done on that hill is going to open up an entire can of worms in terms of what happens to those trees. Whereas if the work stays up there, this whole issue can be avoided.

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you very much for your comments. I'm glad we had a chance to hear them and ...

Ms. Bouhassira: But I'm going to leave some photographs.

Chairperson Sullivan: Buddy's come up with a good solution.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Okay.

Ms. Bouhassira: All right. Thank you everybody.

Chairperson Sullivan: All right, next up we are out of the new public hearings and into some old public hearings. Next up is site plan approval and steep slopes approval the application of PTG1 Development LLC.

IV. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Site Plan Approval & Steep Slopes Approval – Application of the PTG Development, LLC for the construction of a new building containing six townhouse units on its property at Warburton Avenue (aka Nodine Street). Said property is located in the MR-1.5 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.100-94-7 & 8 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairperson Sullivan: Hello, good to see you.

David Steinmetz, Zarin & Steinmetz: Good evening.

Chairperson Sullivan: I think before we get started, Linda and Buddy, if it makes sense to kind of give us an update on what's happened since this application's come to us and has gone to the Zoning Board.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Sure. The Zoning Board, after some minor modifications – I'm trying to find it, I have what the Zoning Board did, I'm sure – the Zoning Board did grant the variances as requested back in March, I believe it was.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And so since that time the applicant has been working to be able to provide you with fully-engineered plans and address all of your open items, as well. The variances included the coverage variance. I think the coverage variance ended up being the only variance that was needed. The Zoning Board also granted view preservation approval.

Building Inspector Minozzi: And they are working with Hahn on all the site work issues – which I included on the dais, Hahn's comments – and the chair had made a few comments of her own. I'm sure you've all been following the e-mails. On the dais is this set, which is an

updated set that's been addressing the chair's comments.

Chairperson Sullivan: I found that Buddy had asked, and I found many of my initial comments were really echoed in Hahn. So there was just one issue of articulation, and I'm sure we can talk about it because I'm sure that'll come up.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Okay.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So this is really now getting down to a lot of the engineering detail – the things that you didn't have when they were here before – including the detail on the road improvements and the utilities and saving drainage and all of those kinds of things.

Chairperson Sullivan: I think we also were talking materials and colors, and I think Mr. Steinmetz mentioned this on his site plan so that's still on our agenda. I'm trying to think what else. That's it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's pretty much it, if they want to present what they've ...

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you, look forward to your presentation.

Mr. Steinmetz: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Pleased to be back before your board. I think you all addressed a fair amount of our intro so I'm going to be extremely brief. With me this evening, just for the record, our project architect, Christina Griffin; my colleague, Katelyn Ciolino; Jim Annicchiarico, whom you all know, from Cronin Engineering, who's been here before; and this evening, for the first time with us, our landscape architect – very pleased that Richard Quigley from IQ Landscape Architects can be here.

Essentially, Madam Chair, as you surmised and summarized, what we were hoping to do tonight is briefly respond to the critical issues that we thought warranted a discussion with your board both from the Hahn memo and from your comments, Madam Chair. Many of the issues in the Hahn memo, as Buddy indicated and as Linda indicated, are fairly technical cleanup issues in the plan with regard to engineering. Cronin Engineering acknowledges those, is already working on those, and we'll resubmit with notes modified and things properly, or differently, depicted on the plans.

What we were hoping to hit tonight are the highlight issues, and present to you a couple of things that Jim Annicchiarico thought were important for discussion on the record. And Richard Quigley is pleased to be able to discuss with you tonight, and put before you, some of the landscape architecture and the issues that we needed to address with regard to, in particular, our neighbors on the north side who previously appeared before us.

Lastly, as Linda indicated and just I wanted to make clear, we did address the Zoning Board. Despite our collective concerns, both as applicant and as board, we were very pleased that the Zoning Board reacted favorably to the application, granted the variance, granted the view preservation, and sent us back here to finalize.

So we're really here now for final site plan details, looking forward to addressing those. And I will yield to Jim to walk through a few things, and then to Richard. And we're here to answer any questions your board may have. Thank you.

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you very much. Do we have a handheld for Jim?

Jim Annicchiarico, Cronin Engineering: Hi. So as David said, since we've been to the Zoning Board we've prepared a fully-engineered set of plans. We did receive comments from Hahn; you know, three pages of comments, which quite often is the case. Some of the issues that I'd just like to touch on – that the board may see, reading through the comments – that may seem more important.

One of the comments was how we construct this retaining wall along the adjacent property line, with the adjacent property. The good news for us is that the applicant owns that property so we can allow ourselves some disturbance there onto that property.

Chairperson Sullivan: A little bit of latitude, right?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah.

But likely that wall still needs to be designed by us, and there are a few different options that we're looking at. One may be a segmental retaining wall. Another would be reinforced concrete, which we could put the L at the bottom for reinforcement onto our side of the property. I don't think that's something that's insurmountable, so that's how we would look at that.

One of the other comments was that the grading up in the northern area here, along the northern property line, looked like it may make some of the runoff going off onto the neighboring properties. I will re-grade that area. Likely what I'll do is put some sort of swale in here and direct it – likely to a basin, a small yard drain or something – down in the grass area, and then connect it into the proposed drainage system.

There was another issue that was brought up about the grade of the road in comparison to the grade of the walkway here in front of the building. This road is fairly flat; it's only about 5 percent right here, and then it goes to about 1-1/2 percent for the majority of it, to the end. However, from about the midpoint of the building to the end, the last 30 feet or so, that will be about 2 feet higher than the waterway. That was going to create a bit of a steep area

behind the curb, and between the curb and the waterway. So what we talked about was pulling the walkway towards the building a little bit to give us a little bit more room. That should be able to ...

Chairperson Sullivan: You have 112 all the way back to the northern entrance, correct? So that's the elevation?

Mr. Annicchiarico: No, all these entrances into the building are 113.6. So they're just slightly less than 2 feet. The road here is 115.5, then it goes to 114.5, 114, and 113.

Boardmember Bass: So when I'm walking north on that sidewalk, to my left will be a 2-foot tall road.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Right. The road will be elevated 2 feet above your feet, just from about this portion to about this portion.

Boardmember Bass: Isn't that kind of strange?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Um, I wouldn't say strange.

Boardmember Bass: I can't picture anywhere else in the Village where I have a road and a sidewalk that has that type of difference in elevation.

Mr. Annicchiarico: You know, roads drop off all the time to the right or to the left. You know, typically sidewalks are even with the curb, however in this case we don't really have much leeway because we are tied in. I probably brought this up in many of the meetings last year when we were going through it, but we are tied into most of these grades ...

Chairperson Sullivan: Right.

Mr. Annicchiarico: ... over on the west side of the property. You know, we got the garages that still need to be accessed and we have a stairway down to that property and, you know, this retaining wall here. So what I did was, I pitched everything away from that wall. Right now, everything goes towards that wall. All the runoff goes towards this wall, towards this driveway. In fact, I believe one of the gentleman who lived in this house was here and said he had to build something to stop the water from going into his garage.

So what I've done is, I've pitched everything away and it'll be all picked up by the basins on this side of the road. So is that kind of odd? I don't know if I'd call it odd, but like I said I can't ... I may be able to lower the road slightly, like a half a foot, but I don't think I want to do it much more than that because it'll allow too much of it in. Then the road would be pitched too much. But like I said, if we move this walkway in towards the building about 2

feet that'll free up this area and we'll have something you really wouldn't even notice very much.

Boardmember Bass: So what would be between the road and the sidewalk?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Grass, or we talked about ground cover; some sort of Vinca or something like that. I'll let Richard, our landscape architect, talk a little bit more about that. But that's what we briefly discussed.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Excuse me. At the top of the road is greenspace?

Mr. Annicchiarico: This is the greenspace up here.

Boardmember O'Reilly: So the road finishes at that point, obviously.

Mr. Annicchiarico: The road finishes right here at the property line, that's correct. This is our garbage enclosure up there. I met with the DPW superintendent, Mike Gunther, and I kind of just wanted to go over everything with him, make sure that there wasn't anything that he disliked or wasn't happy with. Our drainage – I'll show you on the next plan ... here's our utility plan. The drainage, like I said, will be picked up here and it'll run down the south side of Nodine and then tie into an existing basin down here on Warburton.

Right now, there's an existing sewer main that comes up to this point. We will be extending that sewer main up here so we can pick up services from each of the individual units. The water main will extend from the existing 8H water main on the west side of Warburton Avenue, up Nodine, and then terminate here at a fire hydrant. We need health department approval for both of those extensions, which I'll be in the process of doing in the next month.

Chairperson Sullivan: And the storm water's being piped directly into an underground system? You're not retaining stuff.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah, I spoke with ... we did also submit a drainage analysis to Hahn's office. We do show that we are slightly reducing the runoff from the site in the post-development condition, believe it or not.

Chairperson Sullivan: That much gravel.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Pretty much the entire site is hardpan and packed, you know, so it runs off. It's got a very high CN number for runoff. I think the number was about 2.74 cubic feet per second we're running off the site now. Everything from the site pretty much comes this way, right down the south side of Nodine Street. I was there in a pretty heavy rainstorm just to see what was going on. Most of the water just pours right down the side of the street so

that's why I have the basins on this side to pick up all the water.

And the post-development condition: mainly due to the fact that we're adding 3,000 square feet of grass area, we are reducing the actual runoff. It's about 2.51 CFS. But we would be picking up the runoff from the roof leaders and tying that directly into the storm system.

Chairperson Sullivan: And are you putting curbs and whatnot on the sides of the ...

Mr. Annicchiarico: Oh, yes, we do propose curbs here. There'll be a drop curb here to prevent water from coming down the driveway. But we do propose curbs from here all the way down here.

Chairperson Sullivan: And each of the other lots on the Warburton side, those all have to be dealt with separately, right? There's just different site conditions in how you're going to ...

Mr. Annicchiarico: Uh, these lots?

Chairperson Sullivan: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Meaning how we're tying into that?

Chairperson Sullivan: Well, there's different fences and slants.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah, right now there's a retaining wall from here to here. This is a slightly different wall, I believe, than this one. But they're all above grade about 6 inches, at least.

Chairperson Sullivan: Okay.

Mr. Annicchiarico: I mean, if we needed to put a curb over here behind those walls we could.

Chairperson Sullivan: I looked. This is just something for the board to think about. I don't know if it's permitted, but we don't have anything in our code to tell us how big our streets should be. But in the subdivision they do have it and they call it a minor street, which this would be a minor street. And you said that that would be 24 feet wide, and this is 30 feet.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah, that's usually typical.

Chairperson Sullivan: As I thought about adding this much pavement – because, frankly, Mr. Brutto did a beautiful job on that other property but it is in a sea of asphalt – I just

wondered if there's a way to look at decreasing the size of this street because of it being a smaller ... it's not heavily used, and that would give us, say, 9 feet that could potentially be a buffer between the new street and the neighbors on the west side. I don't know if that meets what the fire department wants.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Well, we would need between 24 and 26 feet between the cars, any cars parked. So are you proposing parking on either side of the street?

Mr. Annicchiarico: We are not. As you remember, all the parking's underneath.

Building Inspector Minozzi: And at a bare minimum it would have to be 26 feet.

Chairperson Sullivan: And the reality of it is, probably ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: How wide is Nodine going up?

Mr. Annicchiarico: This right of way is 33 feet.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But the actual paved street.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Oh, coming out there? This right of way is 20 feet. This pavement is ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Eighteen?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Eighteen, yeah.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Sixteen, 18?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah, 16, 18.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I mean, there's plenty of streets in the Village that are ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Oh, no. What I meant by why it has to be that wide is if the hook and ladder has to position itself in front of this building with its outriggers, we measured it ... well, first of all, in The Lofts, actually, is where we came up with it. And that's where we came up with a hard number.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes, so it's probably not a smart idea, given ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: They wouldn't be able to really set up on Nodine Street because it's not wide enough.

Chairperson Sullivan: Basically, by doing that I'm proposing taking away a place for the truck to support the building in case of a fire.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Correct.

Mr. Annicchiarico: At the front portion of Nodine we would still have to be right up to the garages anyway with pavement just so they have access to the garage.

Chairperson Sullivan: I'm just wondering about a way to cut down.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's 30 feet that you're showing, Jim?

Chairperson Sullivan: Thirty-three.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Thirty-three feet of pavement.

Mr. Annicchiarico: It's 32 feet of pavement, the right of way is about 33 feet. Or it is 33 feet?

Boardmember O'Reilly: I missed what you said about parking. Are you not planning to have parking on Nodine, or just not from the Planning Board?

Mr. Annicchiarico: We do not propose any parking. It's all in the parking garage under the ...

Mr. Steinmetz: Inside the building.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Somebody might park there, but you're not planning for it.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Somebody, I guess, could park there.

Mr. Steinmetz: It would be a public street.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Public street, okay.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Unless the Village chooses to make it parking.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Right.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I mean, if they were to park on the west side of the street it would be 8 feet, right?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yes.

Building Inspector Minozzi: For parking. And it's 32 feet, so it's ...

Mr. Annicchiarico: It would be down to 22.

Building Inspector Minozzi: It wouldn't be wide enough to support the hook and ladder.

Chairperson Sullivan: With parking.

Building Inspector Minozzi: No, it would be 26 ... no, it wouldn't be. It would be down to 24, which is not enough. Oh, wait. I have to discuss it with the fire inspector. But 24 to 26 feet is probably the absolute minimum between curb-to-car so I'd have to discuss it with the fire inspector.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Typically a parallel parking space is 10 feet wide by 18 or so long, 22 long with a parallel. So if you took 10 feet off the edge of the retaining wall here we'd be down to 32 feet wide – or I'm sorry, 22 foot wide.

Chairperson Sullivan: We're all having trouble with math. It's late.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I know that when they developed – when the applicant developed – the other side of Nodine, and when he went to re-pave that street, the fire inspector made him stripe a no-parking zone across from the building.

Chairperson Sullivan: That's right.

Building Inspector Minozzi: So just for this reason, because there wasn't enough room there for the hook and ladder.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And that's a taller building so it really needed to be accessible for the hook and ladder.

Chairperson Sullivan: Well, just a possible thought.

Mr. Steinmetz: Madam Chair, certainly we agree. If we don't need to do that width of pavement the applicant would certainly condense it if it were appropriate. Would it change any of your drainage calculations by reducing the pavement? Are we eliminating areas that you're otherwise trying to use to channel water into a catch basin or anything like that?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Right now, like I said, the water runs towards the wall. So by paving

up to it and pitching it the other way we'll be able to maybe extend the longevity of the lifespan of that wall. So really, by doing that I could certainly carve out a spot – a 6-, 8-foot wide corridor – here. And I just don't know. You know, we could plant it in, I guess. It doesn't change my drainage, really.

Chairperson Sullivan: I think Richard and Kerry are already starting to ask some questions about the other side so I think this is an area where we're going to spend a bit of time with you. So let's maybe see what other things you have to share with us, and we'll continue discussing.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Let's see what else.

Mr. Steinmetz: Jim, before you turn it over to Richard Quigley, you received the June 19 Hahn memo. Is there anything in there ... are you addressing ... there were 45 comments. We've touched on about five or six tonight. Are you addressing all the others?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Oh, yeah, we'll address all of the comments. Some of them are just on maintenance, notes, things like that. There's nothing in here that jumps out at me.

Chairperson Sullivan: And so all the retaining walls will be identified on the ...

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah, we'll have to give you details for the retaining walls once we choose what type of retaining wall we want to do. And that will be in the next plan set.

Chairperson Sullivan: One thing I didn't take time to do was look back at the information that we've gotten from the Croton Aqueduct folks. I think we had some discussions during the SEQRA process about monitoring, perhaps, or some kind of observation.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Right.

Chairperson Sullivan: I don't know where we are with that, but we should ...

Mr. Annicchiarico: If you remember, we did that work zone plan for the Aqueduct, specifically for the Aqueduct. We contacted the New York State office of historic preservation and parks. We submitted that plan to them and they didn't have any major comments. In fact, I think they liked it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And that's incorporated into these plans.

Mr. Annicchiarico: That's all part of this plan. The work zone plan is incorporated into my set now.

Chairperson Sullivan: Okay.

Mr. Annicchiarico: You know, we offered up monitoring of the Aqueduct itself during construction. We basically, you know, zoned off an area just behind the foundation where we have to dig for the foundation that we will not be going into with any heavy equipment. You know, there will certainly be work being done behind the building, but not any heavy equipment that could possibly comprise the integrity of the Aqueduct.

Mr. Steinmetz: We would expect that to be a condition of your approval.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah.

Chairperson Sullivan: I just wanted to be reminded of where we were.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah, yeah, there was a whole list of notes I think I put on that work zone plan ...

Chairperson Sullivan: Okay.

Mr. Annicchiarico: ... that I believe, Buddy, you reviewed. And I believe Hahn's office reviewed that as well, and they concurred that was appropriate.

Chairperson Sullivan: Okay, good. Thank you.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Point number 31 in the Hahn report refers to a utility trench detail provided for gas and electricity for those lines. It's probably not part of what we're talking about tonight, but where is the gas service currently? Where is the gas line? I take it doesn't run into this property now.

Mr. Annicchiarico: There is a gas line that comes up Nodine on this side, and it terminates right here at this valve. I'm not sure if this is considered a main or if it just feeds the apartment building. So I have to talk to Con Edison about that and see. They'll have an area between the water and the sewer to go, certainly. And electric comes up to this pole and, right now, it goes underground to this electric manhole. So that will likely continue somewhere out in Nodine Street, as well. But I typically don't design those features. At some point in the process we would submit the set to Con Edison, and then they'll (cross-talk)

Village Attorney Whitehead: "Cause if you design them they're going to change them.

[laughter]

Chairperson Sullivan: They have their way of doing things.

Mr. Steinmetz: Jim, you want to turn it over to Rich?

Mr. Annicchiarico: Sure.

Chairperson Sullivan: Any other questions for Jim before he goes? Okay, thank you.

Richard Quigley, IQ Landscape Architects: This is the first time I'm before you. I'm retained as the landscape architect for this project.

Let me talk about the overall concept here. We decided to use as many native plants as we can. Of course we have a few constraints, such as the deer that went around eating everything. So we have basically a deer-tolerant native palette which deals with the perimeter of the property to the north, to the south, and also to the bottom of the undisturbed slope which transitions to the Croton Aqueduct.

We wanted to create a real sense of a streetscape here and create little garden spaces in front of each unit, as well as street trees to give it a real sense of a street. This is going to be a series of units, but it's really going to give a flavor of what Hastings is all about. So let me talk about what we're proposing to do in the back. We're using a native viburnum, black haw viburnum, which is a very aggressive, tough plant that can deal with the transition to a slope that we don't want to disturb but is truly full of invasive species. But we would not have any intentions whatsoever of touching that slope and trying to compete with that. It's very stable right now. There's trees, shrubs, vines and all that; that if you were to go there today – which I did go – it's very stable, and we don't want to deal with that.

We do have an area behind the building which has garages below. So we have a minimum amount of soil depth and we wanted to go with the ground cover that we know will be able to handle the shade that's there, the depth of the soil constraint that we have there, and tolerant of deer eating it. It's one of the plants on our list that is not native. It's pachysandra, it does very, very well in the shade, and the deer don't eat it. So it's one of the few plants we used on the property that is not.

As each individual has – it's basically a street tree, a low hedge, and a flowering tree kind of almost like a little English garden style, a little, small, scaled-down approach to making each entrance feel like you have your own little private garden – we also have, at the end of Nodine Street, a little community garden area where we have some ornamental flowering trees. We introduced a river birch which, again, is another native that we wanted to use. We used a cedar as a screening plant along here, and these Green Giant cedars which are all along the north side, and American hollies on the south side. And an evergreen plant that is native and will grow quickly as well.

To answer some of the questions about the sidewalk and the awkwardness of possibly having the road higher than the sidewalk, what we've proposed is to do that in ground cover so when it comes to maintenance you don't have to mow it. It'll be a nice gentle slope, and if we do have the opportunity to move that sidewalk over a little bit more it's only going to make that slope even more gentle. But we were going to use a Vinca ground cover in those areas, which is the same material we're using behind the little hedges, and that would solve the problem of anyone thinking that it's a maintenance issue. How do you mow on a steep slope? You don't mow it. You put ground cover in, it establishes itself, gets very thick, and works well.

There's really not much else other than the fact that we're just trying to make this a nice little setting. We'll have a very peaceful architecture.

Chairperson Sullivan: You introduced a green roof.

Mr. Quigley: Oh, yes. I'm sorry, thank you for bringing that up. So we're proposing an extensive green roof which is a minimal-depth green roof system. It's typically around 6 inches, and it's planted with plant materials, predominantly Sedums, which can tolerate extreme drought. And when it rains, they just pop back up. It also is a way of holding back a little bit of storm water. It actually takes in some of the water and it also releases it slowly.

And then we have these small little patios here which are going to be porous pavers so the whole roof system becomes a porous condition rather than a harder condition. So that's basically it. It's tiered down, upper to lower, and we'll make a delightful little space for those two units.

Chairperson Sullivan: When you say "tiered," what do you mean by that?

Mr. Quigley: One is at a higher level than the other. I don't know, what is the difference – change in grade there – Christina?

Christina Griffin, project architect: There's hardly any difference, so about a foot.

Mr. Quigley: It does step down.

Ms. Griffin: Yeah.

Chairperson Sullivan: And what kind of pavement or pavers are you proposing for the walk, the sidewalks? Is that concrete, or ...

Mr. Quigley: Right now it's concrete, yes.

Chairperson Sullivan: And the driveway?

Mr. Quigley: They're narrow ... they're narrow sidewalks. They're very, very residential in scale, really more like kind of going to your house with a little walk that takes you to your front door.

Chairperson Sullivan: And the driveway? Any asphalt or concrete?

Mr. Quigley: I believe it's asphalt. Jim could answer that.

Mr. Annicchiarico: (Off-mic)

Building Inspector Minozzi: Jim, come up to the mic, please.

Mr. Annicchiarico: Yeah, I think we were planning on doing pavers for the driveway.

Mr. Quigley: All the better aesthetically, as well.

Chairperson Sullivan: Any questions?

Boardmember Bass: Can you just go through – because it's really tiny and my eyes are tired – the caliper of the trees that you're proposing?

Mr. Quigley: Okay, I'll go through the plant list with you. We'll go with heights in some of the trees because that's the way nursing stock is done. We're putting the giant arborvitaes at 8 to 10 feet high. We're putting the dark American arborvitaes at 6 to 8. We're putting the American hollies at 6 to 8. We're putting the street trees – which are *Acer rubrum* "October Glory" – a very, very hardy, salt-tolerant, very fast-growing – at 3 to 3-1/2. We've got the river birch, which is going to be 12 to 14 foot high. Eastern redbuds, which is a small flowering tree which we want to introduce in these small little garden spaces. Those, along with Florida dogwood. Both very much native and a really nice spring showy plant.

And then we also have Amelanchier, a serviceberry which, again, is a native tree. It gets its name – shadblow serviceberry – because it blooms at the time of the year in which it had come up the Hudson River. So it's a really indigenous plant and a lovely plant for this area. Then we get down to our shrubs, which range in size from 4 to 5 feet. Pretty much that's the size of the plants we're proposing.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And the river birch is along the ...

Mr. Quigley: The river birch is at this point right here. That's a multi-stem piece, and you

know river birch grow very fast. It'll be a very substantial tree in a very short period of time. We're planting that at 14 to 16.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And just wondering – along the neighbor's, you know, the north side of the lot – what type of screening ...

Mr. Quigley: On this side here?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yes. I can't just read the plans.

Mr. Quigley: Those are giant arborvitae; very, very fast-growing. They're also considered Western red cedar because that's where they're truly native; a very, very well-used plant now. It came into the market probably 10 years ago. It's a plant, again, that is deer-tolerant and very fast-growing. It can grow 2 to 4 feet a year in good conditions. So it's a really good plant for screening.

Building Inspector Minozzi: How tall are they starting out as?

Mr. Quigley: I think we're at 8 to 10.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: To 8?

Mr. Quigley: No, those are the other ones.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Okay.

Mr. Quigley: Six to 8s are the Nigras along here. Dark American Nigras along here, these are 8s to 10s.

Chairperson Sullivan: So in the back, towards the Aqueduct, how high are those going to get?

Mr. Quigley: They're not going to get ... they're shrubs, but they're a native viburnum which does very, very well in a low sunlight condition, which we will have here.

Chairperson Sullivan: So those would be how high?

Mr. Quigley: Maybe 8 feet, somewhere around there. Nothing that's going to get to the height where it's going to block the viewshed or anything like that. That's why we did not propose to put ...

Chairperson Sullivan: And the same with the ones to the north. They're all low?

Mr. Quigley: No, those will get very big.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Eight to 10 feet.

Mr. Quigley: No, those will get large.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: As they should be. I mean, that neighbor's yard is beautiful.

Mr. Quigley: Yeah, those will get 30, 40 feet high.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I would screen them as much as possible.

Mr. Quigley: We really want to, you know, respect our neighbors and do the right thing.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I take it when they're planted it's up to the homeowners to then take care of keeping them maintained? There's no ...

Mr. Quigley: Yes. And typically, a landscape contractor would be responsible for a certain period of time for guaranteeing those plants thrive. And that's, at a minimum, a year. Sometimes we even have a two-year warrantee down with the landscape contractor.

Boardmember O'Reilly: And you said low sunlight at the back there. I can't imagine there being more than 5 minutes of sunlight when the sun's going from east to west.

Mr. Quigley: All of these things back here ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: Yes.

Mr. Quigley: ... really don't require sun at all. Black haw viburnum is truly an under-story plant, does well in a dense forest community. And pachysandra, again, doesn't need any light whatsoever to thrive. We're trying to keep maintenance in mind, too. Once everything establishes, you know, it's not a maintenance nightmare. This is a very maintenance-conscious approach.

Chairperson Sullivan: And how high are the street trees going to be?

Mr. Quigley: At 3-1/2 inch caliper, they'll be about 14 feet high, planted.

Chairperson Sullivan: And then what's their maturity?

Mr. Quigley: I'm sure they're 30, 40 feet. But they really do well as street trees. Their root

systems are not a problem. You can see how other trees that have been used in other areas in Hastings were certain trees that are not all that suited for height conditions.

Building Inspector Minozzi: They won't be blowing out the sidewalks?

Mr. Quigley: Then we have ... you know, they're in nice, long, linear planted areas, which is a much better growing condition than street trees that are, again, little 4 by 4 squares looking for a place for their root systems to kind of site. And they're beautiful. They're one of my favorites. In the fall they're just really colorful.

Chairperson Sullivan: Any other questions from the board? Richard or Kerry?

Boardmember Bass: No, I'm good. Thank you.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I do just want to reiterate that I hope the screening is dense enough for the neighbor to the north. Because it really is a very beautiful yard, and there's the trail right behind it and they're going to have to look at a construction site for I don't know how long. So I really think to be respectful to them and help maintain ...

Mr. Quigley: Clearly understood. That's why the selection of that particular plant. It is just a real aggressive grower.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Okay.

Mr. Steinmetz: Thanks, Richard.

Mr. Quigley: Thank you, all.

Mr. Quigley: Madam Chair, I think Christina had a couple things she wanted to cover to respond to some of your questions in your e-mail.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes, thank you. The question I had asked was, I read through the zoning minutes, or a few things that came up. One was, I think they wanted you to do more articulation in the various façades.

Ms. Griffin: (Off-mic) this one?

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes, that was one of the points. Then there's some question about ... something came up about privacy screens, which I didn't see in the drawings ...

Ms. Griffin: I'll explain that.

Chairperson Sullivan: ... so it'd be helpful to explain that.

Ms. Griffin: I blew this up for you. This is the last version of the front façade that we did for the Zoning Board and received approval. We made some slight changes just to give more articulation to individual units. So each unit has its own color, each unit has a different-colored door. We varied the materials. We have, now, lap siding and stucco.

We also decided that there will be different railing types, going from glass to cable railing. This railing originally was all in alignment; now the railings jog as well as each unit. The trellis at the very top was all aligned and now these trellises are independent and broken, they're not all lined up and attached.

We're also showing, on this rendering, the privacy barriers. These are very much like the ones we did at 400 Warburton. They start at 6 feet and they taper down to this height. They'll probably be made of tongue and groove AZEK and painted. So these are the things we did to try to break up the scale of the building, give it more of a village-like feeling just like in the downtown, even though this is modern, the façades are no wider than 20 feet, which you often see in the filial buildings in Hastings.

If you'd like, I have a view of the previous rendering just so you can see the difference.

Chairperson Sullivan: Sure, that'd be great.

Ms. Griffin: In the previous rendering we had less differentiation of the units because we had just three different colors. We had a fence along the bottom. We eliminated that. We just have landscaping now, I mean plant material. And we eliminated the railing ... they don't line up anymore, there's a jog. They jog, so just as you saw in the previous sketch this did not show the privacy barriers which we introduced. And by eliminating these strong horizontal lines, you end up getting more of a sense of having independent townhouses.

Chairperson Sullivan: Are those jogged railings in a plan? Did you provide that, or ... in the trellises, I was just wondering, and the privacy screenings.

Ms. Griffin: I think, you know, the project is evolving. I think we're going to have to ... we haven't changed the plan schematic or rendering, but this is our roof plan. We are going to ... we have a choice: we don't need to line this up, so we haven't yet. We need to change the plans to match that rendering.

Chairperson Sullivan: And I think also to understand the trellises and where the privacy screens are; having the plan that shows how big those are and where they're at would be good.

Ms. Griffin: Yes. I mean, privacy screens will be in between the decks, and there is a note to indicate that on the plan.

Chairperson Sullivan: Did you make any changes to the rear elevation at all, because we were ... people were ...

Ms. Griffin: The Zoning Board?

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes.

Ms. Griffin: Since we saw you last, I don't believe so. But this is the latest east elevation, and there was a change at some point when we decided to have these vertical window bays. It helped also to break up the façade. I have a rendering that I think the Planning Board did see.

Mr. Steinmetz: You did that for the Planning Board.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think that was done before the SEQRA determination.

Ms. Griffin: I believe so. This is the rendering we did, and we superimposed it into a photograph from the Aqueduct. And we're going to be ... the same color scheme we have in front is going to be reflected in the back so that each unit has its own color so it doesn't read as one mass and more as independent townhouses.

Chairperson Sullivan: Mm-hmm, great.

Richard, any questions, any comments?

Boardmember Bass: No. Again going back to earlier discussions, my concern is with the height of the building. The plans are showing that the ultimate height of the building is below the Aqueduct walkway. I would ask the Planning Board to consider as part of the resolution that if, after construction, that physical condition is higher than the Aqueduct that a C of O be withheld until they ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Well, they have to get an as-built height survey because this is so sensitive with the view preservation.

Boardmember Bass: I understand, but I would like it in the resolution.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Okay.

Boardmember Bass: I want it very clear that that was a major concern for the board. We've

been reassured by counsel that that's not going to be an issue. So if we're all agreeing that we're selling ice in winter, let's put it in the resolution. And if not so, then they don't get a C of O.

Mr. Steinmetz: No objection to that.

Boardmember Bass: I didn't think you would, David.

Chairperson Sullivan: Kerry, any comments?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: No. I mean, I think the articulation helps.

Chairperson Sullivan: This is your first time visiting with this one, so ...

Boardmember Martin: No, no. I actually watched on the video.

Chairperson Sullivan: You are an awesome alternate.

Bill, any comments?

Boardmember O'Reilly: No, I think it's coming along fine. I'm glad everyone persisted with things because the design is turning out better each time I see it.

Chairperson Sullivan: Eva, any questions or comments?

Boardmember Alligood: In addition to what people are saying, I do like the removal of the fence and the more natural vegetation in the front.

Chairperson Sullivan: I think the front's really beautiful. I would like to see some of the articulation brought to the back. I think Michael – when he was here – one of his comments was that the back's almost as important as the front as an elevation. So it would be helpful, I think, to start looking at some of the things you did in the front and bringing them to the back; colors, and maybe even making it feel more like broken-down townhome units like you are in the front.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, I think the board needs to see the plans revised to reflect the revised elevation all the way around.

Chairperson Sullivan: I'm going to give you just a thought that I wondered about. This is very nice in a way because it's kind of very horizontal. I think you talked about in the back that you created it a little bit more vertical with adding in the bay windows. So I would suggest that that same kind of thought process you used towards the front be brought to the

back. You've mentioned shifting things a little bit around, and I throw this out as something to think about.

Another aspect of what you could shift would be some of the volumes themselves, front to back. I mean, you have ... on the plans that I saw – and you may have changed it – from the first railing to the parapet was almost 5 feet. So it was like 20 feet from the front of the building to the first wall of the third floor that you were having a 15-foot deck. So there's like 5 feet between the deck railing and the parapet, and for me that's kind of a ... if I had a little kid that would be an attractive nuisance. You know what I mean? Because you'd jump over the fence and you'd be on a roof.

It could make a difference in variation in the back towards the Aqueduct if these volumes, some of them, would be pushed towards the front. I took a look at the plans and I had some troubles following what you were doing, but you were doing a lot of shifting things – a wall on the floor above 6 inches, or 2 feet – so it might be a way to sort of get into some situations where you aren't doing as much little movements to articulate where you might make a big difference by breaking down the mass, like you've done in the front. By looking at taking that horizontal around that, you're starting on the front and then treating the top floor as a separate element like you're doing in the front elevation.

But the front is a beautiful change, and it's nice to see.

Mr. Steinmetz: Christina, are you clear on the request?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, I'd be happy to continue developing the design. This is the general ... this same concept (inaudible) around so that you see some of the concept on the back of the building. We just need to do a color scheme, look at new (inaudible) materials and ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Come up to the mic.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes, address the mic.

Mr. Steinmetz: I'm sorry, I wasn't paying attention. Thank you.

Ms. Griffin: So, yeah, we'll be happy to show the whole concept follow through around the building.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes. Are you extending the roof now more towards the front? Because it looks like you have created a sort of open trellis. I don't remember that from before.

Ms. Griffin: At the very top?

Chairperson Sullivan: At the very front of the roof on the third floor. It looks like that's been extended now over the roof deck.

Ms. Griffin: This does come forward from the wall up on the third floor, especially since it really does cut down on the solar gain on the west façade. I'm not sure if that answers your question, but what I wanted to do was make sure these were not connected so that you see individual trellises.

Chairperson Sullivan: Was that trellis there before?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, we always had trellises. I'll show you the previous scheme.

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you. I just didn't ... so the one you're proposing is at the same height as this one, right above the doors?

Ms. Griffin: The one I'm proposing, the other one, will have them here. I even used slightly different materials so that they look different. And because this doesn't show the privacy walls or fences it looks like it's just a long line of trellises. The privacy barriers break it up, and I plan to make sure that they don't just straight line up. We might even consider slightly different materials so it looks like each unit has a slight, like, variation on the theme.

Chairperson Sullivan: But these were low at the window height. So now you're proposing them as an extension of the roof? Is that what you're proposing?

Ms. Griffin: This one is at the same height as the roof.

Chairperson Sullivan: As the roof.

Ms. Griffin: Yeah. So it's a different look. I can go back to it if you'd like to see it. But again, just trying to eliminate too many ... that was such a long, linear form, and so was the railing. So we wanted to break that up because it tends to add to the sense of one big block when you line things up like that. And also we're planning to have a little bit more of a gap. They don't have to go all the way. I mean, a little bit of a gap between them so they're not ...

Chairperson Sullivan: I think we're just going to need to see this in planned section and elevation because I'm just concerned. We have this roof shape that we worked really hard on, and now we're adding other things onto the deck – we're adding privacy screens and extending the roof – and at some point I'm worried about things being put on the roof that get to be higher: umbrellas and flagpoles or whatever people want to put out on their deck. So it would be helpful to really know what's being proposed up there so we can make sure it's all going to work well.

Ms. Griffin: Just another level of detail. We can certainly provide that.

Chairperson Sullivan: No, it's nice when you're really getting into the details. It's nice to see, we just need to know what they are.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Is it ARB time, or not yet?

Boardmember Bass: Yes.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I think so.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes, I think so too.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Put it on the calendar.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Start?

Chairperson Sullivan: I think so. I mean, it would be very helpful.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Okay.

Chairperson Sullivan: And I think, boardmembers, it would be helpful to have someone work as a liaison with them on this project for now, and maybe as a liaison going forward. Because Jamie ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: You looking at me?

Chairperson Sullivan: Well, no. I'm letting people volunteer, so no.

Boardmember O'Reilly: As long as I can be helpful, yes.

Chairperson Sullivan: If you wouldn't mind, that would be great. So it would be to go to the next meeting and just be there as a ...

Boardmember O'Reilly: But the Architectural Review Board.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Okay.

Chairperson Sullivan: That they see the time they go with this project.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Okay.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes, that'd be great.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Good.

Chairperson Sullivan: All right, so we want to see more information about the ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: I got it, I got it written down.

Chairperson Sullivan: ... retaining walls and the relationship between the street and building.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Oh, the retaining wall I didn't have written down.

Chairperson Sullivan: Back to Richard's and Kerry's initial discussion. Some interest in better documentation of the changes you're proposing on the roof, and also taking this sort of approach on the front around to the back because it seems to be working out very nicely.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Per Hahn's comments.

Boardmember Bass: Right. So in terms of process, they'll go to ARB and then come back to us for a final vote?

Chairperson Sullivan: Right.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes. Address Hahn's comments, and update the plans to reflect the change to the elevations.

Mr. Steinmetz: I think we're clear on that. We will do a resubmission. We will obviously reach out to you, Buddy. Does the ARB meet during July and/or August?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Uh-huh, every month.

Mr. Steinmetz: Perfect. So we will ... I'm sorry, Madam Chair.

Chairperson Sullivan: No, I have something but please finish your thought.

Mr. Steinmetz: So I think, Richard, we understand we need to do a revised submission responding to the June 19 Hahn memo. We will take care of that. The chair and your board have been very clear on what you need in terms of details all the way around, including the

roof plan and details on this trellis and privacy wall. I think we've got that.

So the onus is on us to resubmit. I appreciate the fact that we've been asked to go to the ARB just to make sure that they're in line with your board so we're not working at cross-purposes. So I gather we would do that next.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes.

Mr. Steinmetz: Then we will do a resubmission to your board, and then hopefully come back and conclude.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Sounds good.

Chairperson Sullivan: One thing, Kerry. I don't know if you had a chance to look at the lighting plan because you've been very focused on that. There are some things.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I haven't had a chance.

Chairperson Sullivan: That's one topic, or detail, we might need to ...

Mr. Steinmetz: Hopefully you'll have your comments beforehand, and if there are comments ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Anything, I'll let you know.

Mr. Steinmetz: Please.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I'll give it to Buddy.

Mr. Steinmetz: Exactly. Get us something in writing so we can address that before. I don't know who was responsible for lighting but, hopefully, you all think we can accomplish what we need to do.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I'm not sure. Say they can't make it to ARB for July because it's very late, I don't know if they'll be able to prepare it or not. Even if they don't go to ARB, should they come back here next month with the Hahn stuff so we can continue working on that? I mean, how do you want to do it?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, they can resubmit to Hahn.

Mr. Steinmetz: Yeah, I think that's ... I agree with Linda, Buddy. I would think Jim and Doug Hahn ought to be able to resolve all that. For the most part, other than the major things

we talked about tonight there's a lot of simple, technical confirmation that the plans were revised.

Building Inspector Minozzi: So maybe if we don't get to the ARB we can do steep slopes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You'd prefer to have the ARB?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yes, I don't want to get into another design discussion until we really hear some feedback from ARB is my feeling. I mean, I don't know if ... you think it's necessary to come back and talk with the engineer.

Building Inspector Minozzi: If steep slopes is ready we could come back, I would think.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Did you want Jim to present on the steep slopes?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: How many trips do you want to make?

Mr. Steinmetz: Yeah, I agree. I would probably rather come back one final time.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Whatever you all want.

Mr. Steinmetz: But Christina, do you think you can get to the ARB that which you need to submit? Is it difficult?

Ms. Griffin: They meet the first Monday of July.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Which is early.

Building Inspector Minozzi: They meet on the 2nd, and that means it would've been already due.

Mr. Steinmetz: Okay.

Building Inspector Minozzi: So we're a little bit ...

Mr. Steinmetz: Got it.

Chairperson Sullivan: I think getting the ARB's input before we see it again would be really helpful.

Boardmember Bass: Yes.

Chairperson Sullivan: I think it'll make it quicker in the long run.

Boardmember Bass: Make it a one-two step instead of a one-two, one-two.

Mr. Steinmetz: I agree. I wish my client was here to confirm. He agrees, but speaking on his behalf it sounds like we're going to the August ARB meeting and maybe your end of August Planning Board meeting?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Sure.

Mr. Steinmetz: Are you all meeting at the end of August?

Boardmember O'Reilly: As far as we know, yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: This board meets ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Sorry, go ahead.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, this board meets. They don't take off.

Mr. Steinmetz: You're not allowed to go on vacation during August, whether you like it or not.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Beginning of August we can go on vacation.

Mr. Steinmetz: Okay.

Building Inspector Minozzi: And, Christina, if you could get it to me ... say, for argument's sake, if you could get it to me Tuesday or Wednesday, I mean we could try to work with you if you got it. We like to have it two weeks before, which would've been Monday, this past Monday. But if everything's in order and I just have to send out the design on Friday, it's tight. It depends on you guys. It's tight. I'll try to work with you, though.

Mr. Steinmetz: Understood. Appreciate that. We'll let Christina review that. I don't want to make her commit right now until she can ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: No, no, I'm not looking for a commitment.

Mr. Steinmetz: Got it. Thank you, all. I think tonight has been productive and helpful, I think we understand the guidance, and we look forward to coming back and trying to conclude the process.

Boardmember Bass: Thank you.

Chairperson Sullivan: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Our last old public hearing.

Boardmember Bass: Oh, c'mon. Let's adjourn.

Chairperson Sullivan: Next up and last up is the site plan approval application of Pam 555 Warburton Realty.

2. **Site Plan Approval – Application of Pam 555 Warburton Realty, LLC for the build-out of a vacant structure to create a mixed-use occupancy to include a restaurant on the basement and first floor levels, and two dwelling units and rooftop bar on the 2nd, 3rd and rooftop levels, at their commercial property located at 555 Warburton Avenue. Said property is in the CC Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-22-1 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairperson Sullivan: Linda, you want to take us off?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Sure. So you'll remember at the last meeting we pretty much went through everything. There were a couple of questions and we, at the request of one of the neighbors, had agreed to re-notice specifically for the rooftop deck to be used as part of the restaurant. Unfortunately there was a little mix-up and it did not get re-noticed. The applicant is aware of that at this point. For the applicant, Buddy had also asked him some questions and he provided some additional information in the last day or two, which you all now have, just to address a couple of things.

What I did – and I apologize for getting it to you a little late, but we can work through it – I prepared a draft resolution. You can't approve everything including the rooftop terrace tonight because we did agree with the public that we would re-notice the rooftop terrace. I wrote this as a resolution that we can go through tonight, go through the conditions, and then just notice it and come back and vote next month. If, for any reason, we really wanted to we could change this to approve everything but the rooftop terrace tonight. But it's probably easier to approve it all at once.

So what I tried to do – and I worked from the resolutions from 2008 and 2009 – I realized, myself, there's probably one or two things that got left out, and Bill already found my typo and so did Eva.

Boardmember Alligood: Good eyes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I was working very quickly.

Chairperson Sullivan: She was. I know when she started this.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's been a bad week. Also incorporated SEQRA and found you had done a negative declaration before. There's actually less impact to this plan. It's a less intensive use so you can redo the negative declaration based on that. Tried to give a little more background in this resolution because the other resolutions were sort of missing that, including the analysis on the parking. And then I got into the conditions. The applicant – my understanding – had agreed to use the number 75 instead of the number 77 so it gets a little complicated. And it's complicated because the same number's used in different ways.

The previously approved plan required a total of 125 spaces. It was also determined at that time – and I found some old memos because I did have Marianne's file – that the previous use of the property had required 76 spaces, which was 67 for the old Hastings House restaurant, five for the karate studio, and four for the two apartments. So it actually required 76 spaces. You'll all remember, from the counts that are on his plans for his proposed uses, it's 77. So it's really only one more than had been required for the Hastings House. And that's based on the square footage and employee number for the restaurant, including the basement, first floor and the rooftop, and then four spaces for the two apartments.

Went through some of the language in the code, which is not well-drafted. Buddy and I have had a lot of trouble trying to explain it. But I did find some memos – a memo that Marianne had in the file from previously – and used that as the basis. And then consistent with the discussion last month with your board, they require 77 spaces. What they had agreed to – and actually now changed it back to 75 – and the problem with the numbers is, that the number of spaces and the number of people were overlapping. And that's where it got confusing. I know that's, Kathy, I think where your confusion came from.

So the prior condition was that if they were going to have more than 75 guests they had to have exclusive right to the Chase lot, with 41 spaces and valet. What I didn't include in here – and one of the things we can talk about – is, in the old resolution I did make a comment that it had all the language about organized events over X number of people they need this many valets and over that number of people they need Y valets. I didn't put that level of detail in because this isn't as intense a use. So it's up to the board if you want to put that in.

So the first condition I have is just Chase, for the same condition. That for up to 75 restaurant guests, if you will, they don't need any additional parking. Over 75, they can have

– at the times that they have the exclusive – use of the Chase lot. And then as with the prior approval, if, for any reason, the Chase lot no longer becomes available they can find another location for those spaces. One thing that I added that was not in the old, but which we all talked about and I think is really a good idea, is to specify that they can also use valets to park at the commuter lot at night and on weekends. Because I think that's something the Village wants to encourage.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So I did add that in. The language about employees is a little bit clarified from the old one we talked about last month. Zinsser Park parking lot ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: But people could just walk from the Village lot to the restaurant.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes. Well, then we go back to that issue about perceived parking problems versus real parking problems.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yes, okay.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So the Zinsser Park parking lot Monday through Friday during the day for the employees; Zinsser commuter lot for employees at night and on weekends. Under no circumstances can employees park on Maple, and the owner of the property – the operator of the restaurant – should be responsible for enforcing that. That's essentially the same as what was in the prior resolution.

The rooftop terrace, we talked about – and I think everybody agreed last month – until 11 o'clock. I know we talked about it seasonally. The applicant had proposed from the first day of spring 'til the last day of autumn. I kind of left a blank because the last day of autumn, technically, is December 20.

D'Wayne Prieto, Ward Capital Mgmt.: I did not know that. I actually looked that up, and I was like, Okay, this is not going to work.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Which is, I think, a little late.

Mr. Prieto: So if you want to call it November 1st I'm okay with that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: November 1st?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: You could have a gorgeous Thanksgiving there. You might want it December 1st.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You want to do December 1st?

Mr. Prieto: December 1st, yeah. Just because weather patterns are trending kind of late. You just never know.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So we have that it can be used seasonally from March 21st through December 1st between 5 p.m. and 11 p.m.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Right.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Okay?

Mr. Prieto: Can I also, just as a point of clarification, for condition number one ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Oh, you want to go backwards?

Mr. Prieto: Yeah, I didn't want to interrupt you.

Building Inspector Minozzi: We're on a roll.

Mr. Prieto: Condition number one, I just want to make sure that we specify that correctly because it's not only 565, it's also our lot that we're sharing. So in order to make up the 41 spaces is ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: So we'll just say including the seven spaces that are part of 555.

Mr. Prieto: Right. Just as a point of clarity so that in the future there's no ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yep. Well, what we found really problematic was that the old resolutions didn't have any of this. Right, Kathy? The background?

Chairperson Sullivan: No, I think that was tough.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Okay. And then the no light spillage beyond the parapet came from the prior. I added what we talked about last month about speakers located on the roof shall be below the parapet level, or directed downward. Of course the noise is going to have to comply with the Village's noise ordinance.

Then I had my question about do we need to put in the provisions about organized events and valets. I mean, my understanding is this is going to operate as a restaurant, it's not going to

be a ...

Mr. Prieto: Right, it's not a catering facility.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's not a catering facility. So the real concern with that language last time was events where everybody's coming at the same time.

Building Inspector Minozzi: That was a big concern, from what I understand.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So if you have just a regular restaurant you're not going to have that same issue. So does everyone agree we don't need that?

Boardmember Bass: Right.

Chairperson Sullivan: Well, what's the basement set up for? How are you going to use the basement space?

Mr. Prieto: So the basement is set up as a bar. The way we were looking it is, as the night progresses or if there's overflow in the restaurant that the lower level will capture that space.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Or people waiting for a table want to sit and have a drink.

Mr. Prieto: Right. Correct.

Village Attorney Whitehead: In the middle of winter, when they're not going up on the roof.

Boardmember Bass: It's a queuing space.

Chairperson Sullivan: I would vote, or propose, that we keep some language about organized events in there just as a protective device because your plan could change.

Mr. Prieto: I'm totally ... it doesn't make any difference to use for marketing purposes and for functionality and logistics if they were. It's the same thing where we'll use and engage in any way in the business plan.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I mean, I can work with the old language and stick something back in.

Chairperson Sullivan: Just in case there's a party in the afternoon on a Saturday and ...

Boardmember Bass: A wedding.

Chairperson Sullivan: Wedding, a bar mitzvah, you know. Someone mentioned that was always a ... they're already eyeing the space. So just something in case that gets to be true.

Boardmember Bass: It's a good point, Kathy.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I took out, from the old approval, the limitation on lunch because we all agreed that it wasn't necessary.

Chairperson Sullivan: And that was something – a train of thought – that we never (cross-talk) ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: I can tell you that I went out to dinner in the Village the other night and had no problem parking whatsoever.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Gee.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And it's scary because I was sitting in Boro6 looking at this building.

[laughter]

Boardmember Martin: Wondering why it's still empty.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Then the next one is what we discussed last month also: the air conditioning units for the residential units are going to be self-contained units.

Mr. Prieto: Right.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The air conditioning units for the restaurant – which I see are now on the revised plans that we got – are on the roof, but below the height of the parapet.

Mr. Prieto: Correct.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The loading space language is from the old resolution, and I think they had agreed with that. The next condition is, again, something from the old resolution, a standard one.

The next one the board needs to talk about because you have two residential units going in here. You can make these findings and determinations and charge a recreation fee, but it's up to the board whether ...

Mr. Prieto: I'm sorry, just you went so fast on the rate.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I'm sorry.

Mr. Prieto: So just again for point of clarification here, no change in the layout or use. I understand the use, but I don't understand the layout. What does that mean?

Village Attorney Whitehead: I took that language out of the old resolution.

Mr. Prieto: If our final designs come out that logistically the bar ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: We can make it just the use, right? We can make it just the use.

Mr. Prieto: Okay, that's fair.

Boardmember Bass: I don't want to go in and measure where the tables are.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Because if you change the use of a space, it's fine, yes.

Okay, so the recreation fee is really ... I mean, this building had two apartments in it in the past.

Building Inspector Minozzi: That's my only concern.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, that's why they would have to make a finding, and they may not be comfortable making that finding that it creates a new demand if there were apartments in there previously. So it's really up to this board whether you feel there is a need; that adding this creates a demand for parks and recreational facilities that didn't exist before, when there were two apartments here.

Chairperson Sullivan: My feeling – and I know it's not really taken in the code – is that downtown, when we're trying to make people feel like they can change the space around depending on whatever they want it to be, whatever the market says – is that I think I've argued that in another one of these applications I don't feel comfortable doing a rec fee. New units from the ground up, like what we saw in the six units, I would propose not.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I wanted the board to have the discussion.

Boardmember Bass: I'm comfortable with that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Okay, so we're not going to put it in.

Boardmember Bass: No fee.

Village Attorney Whitehead: No fee, okay.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes.

Boardmember Bass: Thank you.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And then I know the last one also came out of the old approval. I know that you had said the garbage was going to be done the same as on the prior. Buddy, does this show on the plan where they're doing the garbage? Are you comfortable?

Building Inspector Minozzi: It's a point that we are going to bring up with the DPW superintendent.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes. And that's why we have in here that they have to consult with DPW, even on where you put the garbage out and where it gets picked up. Okay.

Building Inspector Minozzi: It's where it was before with the Hastings House. And I shouldn't say I'm sure, but I'm fairly certain the DPW superintendent's going to be okay with it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Okay.

Building Inspector Minozzi: I know the garbage in the downtown does get picked up five days a week so I will get him to check.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And you have to pay or we get mad at you.

Mr. Prieto: Pay the garbage pickup?

Village Attorney Whitehead: There is a commercial garbage pickup in the Village.

Mr. Prieto: Is that like a monthly, or ...

Male Voice: Monthly, the garbage?

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think so. It's based on how many containers. The Village clerk can tell you.

Mr. Prieto: Is that all restaurant waste, or ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's all commercial pickup, for commercial.

Mr. Prieto: Oh, okay. Great.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Because in some municipalities they don't pick up commercial.

Mr. Prieto: Yeah, we have to pay for it anyway so I was confused. Okay, got it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Here, the Village does pick it up.

Mr. Prieto: Got it.

Boardmember Bass: And we're cheaper than a commercial carter.

Village Attorney Whitehead: What I didn't put in – and I know a lot of these things ... I know you've incorporated a lot of these conditions and notes on the plan so the resolution's, in some ways, repetitive on some of these things. I didn't put in the provision – it was discussed a little bit today – about the petitioning to move the mailbox and the tree, and eliminating the bike rack. So you can put that in.

Chairperson Sullivan: Okay.

Building Inspector Minozzi: So we're adding that in, Linda?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, I'm going to add that. I have a bunch of notes on here, including my typo. You guys find any other typos? I'm surprised.

I know there's been some discussion – and Buddy and I have had a little disagreement on the question that was raised last month – about whether there's a requirement for the fire lane. There is not technically a code requirement for a fire lane. I meant to drive by there on my way here tonight, and I forgot. Buddy had indicated that the fire department wants the fire lane. I was trying to figure out what ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: *Maintain* the fire lane.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I was trying to figure out what building the fire lane is there to serve because it's not to serve this building, it's not to serve Chase. It's to serve the firehouse ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Correct.

Village Attorney Whitehead: ... for fire access to that side of the firehouse building. But Buddy, do they understand that if it's made a fire lane they can't park there either?

Building Inspector Minozzi: They're going to have to understand it. More likely, it's going to be striped and it's going to be an actual fire lane.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So Buddy's position is that the fire department ... it's not a code requirement, it's a fire department ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: My position is the fire department's position.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The fire department has taken the position – and this is through Buddy – that they do want a fire lane there, which would eliminate, what, three or four spots?

Building Inspector Minozzi: Four.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So it takes that 41 down to 37. Now again, when ...

Mr. Prieto: There's several issues that ... I just want to make sure we're all ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Can I just finish what ...

Mr. Prieto: Yeah, okay.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, let me just finish my thought on this. So if we did that, it takes it from 41 down to 37. Now, one thing that I think is important for the board to remember is that the prior approval required 125 spaces, or 123 depending on what you look at. Their total requirement – because the apartments have so much less use than the wellness center or the banquet facility before it – is only 77 spaces. So their requirement is 50 spaces less than the prior. So it's really whether the loss of those four spaces is really going to have an impact when your total parking requirement is so much less than on the prior approval.

Mr. Prieto: I have a vested interest, obviously, in that property. And if that property ever goes for sale I will probably jump on it. And so with that ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Don't count on it happening.

Mr. Prieto: Yeah. In that context, our position is as long as we get credit for the parking we're going to work around the parking. But it's a private lot, and to put a fire, standing-only,

whatever it's called ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: Fire lane.

Mr. Prieto: ... it's kind of ... it's murky waters to go with. In addition to the fact that Chase might not be in compliance if you take those parking spaces away from them.

Building Inspector Minozzi: They don't have them now.

Mr. Prieto: Oh, it's their property so we don't know if they're ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: It's a posted fire lane, it's been a posted fire lane.

Mr. Prieto: See, I didn't know you could post a fire lane in private property.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: It's private property, there's no real fire need.

Boardmember O'Reilly: A fire lane is something that goes ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: It goes somewhere.

Boardmember O'Reilly: ... *through* somewhere. It's not a parking lot.

Village Attorney Whitehead: This one doesn't go anywhere.

Building Inspector Minozzi: But the code specifically says it's whatever ... in lieu of having a fire access apparatus road, apparatus access road, that anything that satisfies the AHJ ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: But that's the fire department's problem? Because it's for access. They can't require that a private property owner provide fire access lane for their property. If it was for Chase, which it isn't ... it's a private parking lot.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Privately, I don't think someone could build something.

Building Inspector Minozzi: There already. How can they take it away?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Maybe Chase is being nice, but ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: But you can't require one building ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: It's private property.

Village Attorney Whitehead: He can't have a fire access lane in the Chase parking lot to serve his building because it's taking somebody's private property.

Building Inspector Minozzi: Well, you just got to give me the determination and I'll give it to them. It's not my decision, it's not me asking.

Mr. Prieto: But from our stance, it's ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: One other thing on this point. There was – from the fire approval, because I went through the file – a memo from a meeting of the Safety Council, which included a representative of the fire department, that indicated they were okay with the 41-space layout. So at that time, this was not an issue. And remember, this parking is exactly as it was approved before.

Boardmember Alligood: I have to say, Linda, even before the applicant spoke up I thought it was a very strange requirement. Because I don't get it. Could somebody require my driveway to be a fire lane?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Their fire access?

Boardmember Alligood: I don't get it.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Yes. Like legally, I don't know how you do it unless you use eminent domain.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Was it ever approved that way by the Board of Trustees or anything?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Hmm?

Boardmember O'Reilly: The Board of Trustees never approved it that way.

Village Attorney Whitehead: No, the more I looked at it – and like I said, Buddy and I have had quite a bit of back and forth on it – it didn't seem to make sense to me. And I don't think that this applicant can agree to it because it's not his property.

Chairperson Sullivan: Though he just has the agreement to use the property, Chase's lot, at ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: At certain times.

Chairperson Sullivan: ... certain times. And you ...

Mr. Prieto: We have a mutual agreement. So they could use our spaces, I could use their spaces.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And I don't remember if you gave us a signed copy of the agreement, but that's going to be a condition.

Mr. Prieto: Yeah, so totally on the side. I didn't sign the agreement.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You were waiting.

Mr. Prieto: Because I was waiting for if we were going to do two or four units. So now I could go back and say this is what the numbers are and then so on and so forth.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's fine. It'll just be a condition that you provide the signed agreement. I've also added in there a provision that four of the spaces are for the apartments. And that can be for the seven that are on your actual property.

Chairperson Sullivan: That's what I was wondering. If you would ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, you mentioned that and I did put that in there. So did anybody have any other questions on the draft or anything you think that left out?

Boardmember O'Reilly: No.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: No.

Boardmember Bass: Pretty thorough.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: It was.

Boardmember O'Reilly: I thought it was well done.

Boardmember Bass: So path forward.

Chairperson Sullivan: Fast-forward, this gets revised and we get re-noticed.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Be it on next month just for a vote, and to see if anybody to be re-noticed ... see if anybody speaks. If nobody comes and speaks, we'll just vote.

Mr. Prieto: Great.

Boardmember Bass: And we'll put you first.

Mr. Prieto: Thank *you*.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, I was going to say I've had this running conversation also with Buddy about the order of the agenda because I think sometimes old things should come first, not new.

Chairperson Sullivan: In your case, since you're here by yourself ...

Mr. Prieto: It was good to see all my colleagues here performing, so it was good.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So, yes, we will put you first.

Mr. Prieto: All right, thank you so much. And just an update. With this resolution, with this draft, I could actually get the tenant to sign the lease. So this is something.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And what I'll do is, I'll ... I can't promise to do this tomorrow. I'll make the revisions on Monday and I'll get it to Buddy, and he can get it to you.

Mr. Prieto: Great.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So you'll have the actual revised ...

Mr. Prieto: Perfect. Okay, so I'll wait. Thank you so much. Have a great night.

Boardmember Bass: Can I make reservations?

Chairperson Sullivan: Just one thing, Linda. I think regarding putting in the language again for the valet parking, the difference ... like there was the 75 ...

Building Inspector Minozzi: I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Putting in the language about organized events for the valet. You know what? Let me take a shot at it. I will e-mail it around to you guys next week.

Chairperson Sullivan: I'm just going to give you ... we had ... we were going from 75 to 126; we're going from 75 to whatever number.

Boardmember O'Reilly: Forty-one.

Chairperson Sullivan: This max. Let's pick one valet level.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, it was complicated the way it was. And there was even ... I even saw some notes that had a lot of discussion about do we really need to do this even then.

Chairperson Sullivan: Yes, let's just pick one number, one valet or two valets, something simple.

Okay, thank you folks. May I have a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Prieto: Thank you. Good night.

***** The Following Applications are Deferred to Future Meetings *****

- 3. Site Plan Approval – Application of Tabi Realty LLC – 425 Warburton Avenue.**
- 4. Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Mirjana Alilovic for the gross illegal re-grading and drainage of backyard on her property located as 12 Prince Street. Said property is located in the 2-R Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.140-151-11.2 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Village Attorney Whitehead: Oh, we can do the minutes now. We held off the May minutes because Eva was here. So we're good now, you can vote on the May minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Continued)

Regular Meeting of May 17, 2018

Chairperson Sullivan: Do you have any comments on the May minutes?

Boardmember Alligood: No.

Chairperson Sullivan: So may I have a motion to approve?

On MOTION of Boardmember O'Reilly, SECONDED by Boardmember Bass, with a voice

vote of 5 approvals (Boardmember Gould-Schmit abstained), the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of May 17, 2018 were approved as presented.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting Date – July 19, 2018

VI. ADJOURNMENT

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