

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
JULY 18, 2019**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, July 18, 2019 at 8:15 p.m. in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

PRESENT: Chairperson William O'Reilly, Boardmember Kathleen Sullivan, Boardmember Eva Alligood, Boardmember Kerry Gould-Schmidt, Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., Planning Consultant Patrick Cleary, and Planning Board Meeting Assistant Jennifer Petillo

Chairman O'Reilly: Good evening. It's Thursday, July 18, 2019. Can we have a roll call, please?

I. ROLL CALL

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you, we have a quorum. And the first item for the agenda is an approval of minutes of the meeting of June 20, 2019

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of June 20, 2019

Chairman O'Reilly: Do we have any comments on the minutes?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Kerry was not here, right? Why don't you put them over and see if somebody else comes.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, we'll hold over until we get anyone else who may make a quorum. Therefore, we can move on to the first of the old public hearings.

III. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. View Preservation Advisory & Site Plan Approval – Application of River Road, LLC for the creation of a new greenhouse and exterior renovation at their property located at 100 River Street. Said**

property is located in the MW Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-19-4 on the Village Tax Maps.

(**This Public Hearing has been Deferred to Future Meeting*)

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

Chairman O'Reilly: Would you please come, introduce yourself, state your name and company?

Kristine Magliano, associate – Matthew Cordone Architect PLLC: Hi. First, I just want to apologize on Matthew Cordone's behalf. He couldn't be here this evening, and I'm going to present on his behalf this evening.

Chairman O'Reilly: Very good. I understand you have a presentation?

Ms. Magliano: I do, and I understand that the animation we sent to the board was too large for you to receive it so I think I'm going to start there.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you.

Ms. Magliano: This video is basically going to show the volume and how it relates to the Warburton bridge, and that kind of takes you down West Main Street, past the parking lot, and then down into the Metro-North parking lot. Here's a view of the bridge, then we're coming down to the Steinschneider parking lot, then it comes around and brings us back to the Metro-North train platform.

Boardmember Alligood: Could we see the retaining wall again?

Ms. Magliano: Yes.

Boardmember Alligood: Really striking.

Chairman O'Reilly: Can you hold it at the retaining walls?

Ms. Magliano: Sure, I can pause it there.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think there was also some plans submitted that had some more detail on the retaining walls.

Ms. Magliano: And we also have some renderings, too. Like shots looking at the retaining walls ...

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes.

Ms. Magliano: ... in both summer and fall.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That may be easier to see it.

Boardmember Alligood: No, I want to see it because this is what we're going to see.

Ms. Magliano: You want to see there?

Boardmember Alligood: Yes, stop right there.

Ms. Magliano: Keep in mind it's also going to be heavily vegetated. This is just more so to give an idea.

Boardmember Alligood: Basically, can you see it from the side, too, because as you go further towards the bridge? Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: There.

Boardmember Sullivan: How tall are the walls?

Ms. Magliano: I will pull up the plans

Boardmember Alligood: Is that supposed to be the same view as this?

Ms. Magliano: I think so, yeah.

Boardmember Alligood: So is that supposed to be the same as what you've shown here? Because here, the retaining walls don't go down nearly as far as that.

Ms. Magliano: Yeah, so there are two very ... because this is like an aerial fly-through, so you're looking at it from a much higher perspective. Whereas that one, I believe, is taken at like where you're standing down in the parking lot and you're looking up at it. And I think the max height for the retaining walls had to be 6 feet.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: 6 foot 6 is the max height.

Boardmember Alligood: Okay, 'cause I didn't remember it being a massive retaining wall. But from *that* fly-through it looks like it almost reaches the parking lot. That's why I'm ... that's huge, that's not 6 feet.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And that shows three walls.

Ms. Magliano: It's probably not showing a true grade because the slope over there is significantly ... like it drops significantly. So I think maybe it's just not modeled 100 percent accurately to show what the earth is actually doing around those retaining walls.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Are there two, or three, retaining walls?

Ms. Magliano: There are three.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Three tiers, yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: Have you said how far apart?

Ms. Magliano: I believe, minimum, we had them at 3 feet for a while.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So there are three 6-foot walls?

Ms. Magliano: I don't know that they're all exposed 6 feet.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Okay, the bottom one may not.

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, this aspect of it would definitely need engineering.

Ms. Magliano: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: 6-foot wall, yes.

Ms. Magliano: Yeah, we do have a team of engineers that are ready to jump on board.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And the disturbance ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: I mean, this has always been the board's stated concern is this view.

Boardmember Alligood: These are very different depictions of what it may look like from the parking lot, and I think we need to really get a good sense of what it looks like: how the

retaining walls are staggered, and what they're going to look like. So if that's inaccurate, then we need to see an accurate view of it because that would be a really big change of what we look at when we are in anywhere sort of at the entrance to our village when you're coming off the train. I would say if it's going to look like that it needs to be covered with vegetation. Not just dirt, but I mean greenery.

Ms. Magliano: Right. Our goal is to heavily vegetate it, similar to how it is now, how densely vegetated it is now so when you look up you don't really ... you're not ...

Boardmember Alligood: Well, I'm not talking about just putting some plantings around it. I'm talking about covering the retaining wall itself because I don't think that's going to be adequate.

Ms. Magliano: Right, like a climbing vine – something that's there – maybe some evergreens so that they're all year-round?

Chairman O'Reilly: Since we've done a mockup of the lot, given the retaining walls the expanse of them – if there were some way ... is there some way that we can also do a mockup of these retaining walls? Because that would be sort of giving us a better idea of how much of that slope is going to be ...

(Cross-talk)

Right. Yeah, I think that's something we could look into and put together, reach out to our engineer.

Chairman O'Reilly: The engineers could do it because visually, I mean, we've got two different visual representations here. And the one at the top – the one at the top you have there, sort of the cross-section one – shows it as being quite less of the slope having to be engineered as opposed to what it looked like in that spin-around one.

Boardmember Alligood: You're talking about this.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes. I mean, the one that spun around looked like a stadium.

Ms. Magliano: Yeah.

Chairman O'Reilly: So that would be something that we would like to just add to the record: that any engineering part of the slope needs to have a mockup. Because something that would give us an idea of the dimensions of the lot is very helpful, and the height of the lot. But the slope has always been an issue that we're very vague about.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: You want them to do a mockup of the retaining walls?

Village Attorney Whitehead: I don't think you can because there's cut. I think what you need is probably an engineered plan showing you the cut and fill.

Male Voice: (No mic)?

Ms. Magliano: I believe so, yeah, and it's going to have a footing. It would need a footing.

Male Voice: (no mic).

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, the footings are quite deep.

Boardmember Sullivan: What's the elevation at the grade that meets the top wall; the parking spaces that are going to be at that top level?

Ms. Magliano: Looks like 86.

Boardmember Sullivan: And what's the entrance elevation to the building?

Ms. Magliano: 96 is the front of the lot, pulling in.

Boardmember Sullivan: So you're 10 feet from the entrance in the front of the lot to the ...

Ms. Magliano: Where that first wall would drop down.

Boardmember Sullivan: So what's the elevation at the back of the building, where the doors are?

Ms. Magliano: Oh, 92 – between 92 and 94.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, we need to understand 92 to 86. A 6-foot drop, right?

Ms. Magliano: Correct.

Boardmember Sullivan: So we have to understand that's a fairly significant drop. Over 50 feet, right?

Ms. Magliano: Roughly 50 feet.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: You need to see the percentages of that parking area of the slope?

Male Voice: That shows to be a fairly steeply-sloped parking area. I don't know that we want to have it that steep. The trade-off would then be (no identification, no mic) retaining walls ...

Ms. Magliano: Right.

Boardmember Sullivan: In their plans, they're showing consistent, that 92, all the way across towards the back. It seems like it's completely level in the elevation, but not in the plans. When you look at your sections, or even your elevations, you see sort of a straight line from the street all the way back to that wall. But it's really not the case.

Ms. Magliano: Right.

Boardmember Sullivan: It's going to have a drop from the front to the back of over 10 feet, and you're talking 6 feet from the back of the building to that wall. The wall height seems to be in confusion right now, and the grading of the site seems to be not all the way completed.

Ms. Magliano: Right. Like there would be a curb between the walkway and the driveway basically; the pedestrian path to the door on the side down by the driveway.

Chairman O'Reilly: We're talking about the rear.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The parking lot slopes.

Boardmember Sullivan: We're talking about the whole site sloping, and your drawings are showing it as flat.

Ms. Magliano: Right, correct. So if I were to drop that, there would be some sort of a curb or a wall adjacent to the building to get you down to that.

Boardmember Sullivan: Would the cars have to be, as well? The whole thing ... there's no indication of the slope.

Ms. Magliano: No, no, no, I understand. I'm just saying that, graphically, we would have to show the slope, and then there would be a wall because there's also a pedestrian path there. So if that's going to come and maintain flat, then there would be a curb that stays flat. But you would see that because then the driveway would pitch back.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I think we've seen the application several times. I think because the site is ... it's a difficult site because of the slope. I mean, I think unfortunately you're going to have to engage an engineer. I just don't think there's enough detail for us to comment on the application until we fully understand the retaining walls. Whether you bring in someone civil, there's a lot beyond architectural we have to see. So I think it's fairly

difficult for us to take a final vote on the application until more information comes forward.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, our questions are really ...

Ms. Magliano: Yes, we do have a team of engineers on board, one of which is civil. So, I mean, that's something we ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think you've seen the architecture on the lot. I think it's time that you need to see some engineering.

Chairman O'Reilly: Right. It's the engineering question.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Just because it is a difficult site.

Ms. Magliano: Right.

Boardmember Sullivan: I have some comments about the architecture. I mean, I knew there were some discrepancies in the plans, but I'd love to, at some point, be able to share some thoughts about the building itself because we haven't really spoken about that.

Chairman O'Reilly: No, not yet. But the other thing I think we haven't gotten sufficient information about is actually what's the first part of this, which is the view preservation. Because we see the directions in which they're going, but I know in an earlier presentation there were a few photographs taken from the back of the building along Warburton Avenue. And looking at what the building is you're going to do in terms of view preservation – the extent to which it is intruding on any view, to the extent that it is – obviously there's many trees around the site that you don't see through anyway. But some of those trees are going to come down. The question is, looking at it from that point of view as far as view preservation is concerned, I think we still need a little more information and some representations looking at the building from the parking lot – and I can't remember the name of it.

Ms. Magliano: The Steinschneider parking lot.

Chairman O'Reilly: Steinschneider parking lot, yes. And even if I'd remembered it, I would've had trouble saying it. That would be helpful. But having said that ... Kathy?

Boardmember Sullivan: I mean, I wanted to be respectful of this application coming back again and to give some comments rather than just being critical of the fact the drawings are kind of a shambles, so to speak. A lot of inconsistencies.

But I would like to propose that, starting at the front, it's unclear from the drawing where the porch is in relationship to the bulk of the building. You have a dimension of 69 feet, and it

doesn't seem to include the porch. And the footprint on the site plan is 69 feet, but when you go to one of the upper-floor plans that excludes the porch. So that needs to be clarified exactly how long this building is.

I think also the building isn't sited in relationship to the property lines nor to the stairs going down to the parking lot, the train station. However, it looks like the terrace you have on the side is shown quite large on some of the full floor plans. It may be up to 15 feet, but it looks like you've given about 10 feet for it, in reality, when you look at the site plan. So that needs to be sort of clarified exactly how big that is.

You also provided some 3-D renderings of the front of the building in our package. I don't know if you want to show those, but it has a porch, it has towers, and it has a central part that's pushed back. And none of that's showing up on the plans of the upper floors. Again, it's how big is this building exactly, how wide is it?

And if you wouldn't mind, if you would put up that 3-dimensional view from the Steinschneider parking lot it would be helpful. Do you have the one that you provided in our package rather than this because this one's actually sunk down, and it's confusing.

Ms. Magliano: The one that you have in front of you, or (cross-talk) package?

Boardmember Sullivan: This one.

Chairman O'Reilly: Oh, that one.

Boardmember Sullivan: It was a colored rendering. It might have been in the view preservation package, I don't remember.

Ms. Magliano: Oh, I don't have that one with me.

Chairman O'Reilly: Oh, this one.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes, this guy: R-100?

Ms. Magliano: Oh, you know what? I do have that, I'm sorry. Give me one second.

Boardmember Sullivan: That's nice because it sort of shows the context that this building is in. One thing, we were very interested in was trying to have a buffer zone to imitate the porch and have a setback from the stairway to the building, using that type of device. But I think in reality the porch itself is going to be very high above your head. You don't go very far in front of this building as you're walking towards the river before you're already going down the stairs.

I would like to suggest that you imitate another type of entrance that's at the street, which is the middle house that is sort of pinkish that has a single entry. What's happening in the front is, you have two entrances: you have the main entrance to the building, and then you have the entrance to the studio apartment coming off that porch. You also have, on the side of the building, the entrance to the duplex – one-bedroom apartment – coming off where you talked about putting a walkway.

I would propose that all of the doors on the exterior, with the exception of the rear door and the front entrance door, be removed. And the point is that when you're part of a building – if you're in the studio, which I think is going to be affordable housing, or in the duplex – you go into the building and meet people in the corridor, you meet them going to the mailbox, you meet them going to the laundry room. You know, that's sort of the internal street of sorts, where people meet. You've taken two units, and for no real reason tossed ... you know, their main entrances are out away from that zone.

Even on the side, you have an exterior door leading into storage. I would think storage would be wisely integrated into the interior of the building rather than the outside. If I'm going to go bring in a bag of books I don't want to walk around the building, I want to go down in my slippers and put them in the thing, get in and out quickly. Many years ago I did some affordable housing, and one of the things that would be, I think, advantageous is to imitate the thought of putting the laundry room on the exterior wall so you can have light. Because that is also another place where people can sort of gather and meet each other. Those are just some suggestions when it comes to that.

What I would propose is that if the idea is sort of making a single entrance and maybe making it more an entryway rather than a porch, I think you could potentially make some changes to the front elevation where, dimensionally, it relates better to the other structures on that block. This is very wide and short, and if you created sort of a single tower and had sort of the rest of the building sort of be in a better proportion – and I'm talking about the horizontal dimensions of the other buildings – I think it'll be much more integrated. Because many façades don't have much articulation at all so they seem sort of flat and big and unsightly in some way.

I know you'll be talking to the architectural review board at some point, which is great, but I think just from my perspective sort of as a planning thing it did talk about a central entrance. I think it would be better brought to be shifted towards the left of the building because I think that's actually where you're going to get in and out of that building.

And the last things are regarding the integration of the driveway across where people are going to walking back and forth from the train station. I think we really need to look at the upper part of that stair and figure out a way to maybe do, through continuing the sidewalk –

even maybe guiding the cars in and out – there's going to be a place for conflict. And we need to figure out how not to make these sort of a dangerous situation for people.

Ms. Magliano: You're talking about where we show gates for the cars to leave our driveway, and how close they are?

Boardmember Sullivan: I don't know if I've seen the gates, so I'm sorry if I missed that.

Ms. Magliano: No, that's okay. So coming around to the driveway, there's a double ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Oh, those big things.

Ms. Magliano: And when they're activated, there's also going to be a horn and strobe that's activated so that people, pedestrians, anyone – even vehicular traffic – going through the parking lot will also be alerted that some movement is coming in and out of that driveway.

Boardmember Sullivan: Thank you for pointing that out, I missed that. It would be helpful to have that looked at and make sure they're in the right position, swinging in the right direction, you know.

Ms. Magliano: Yeah, we kind of pulled them back a little bit so they were kind of behind the front of the building. They're even set back behind the porch completely. I mean, the intent of this was to make it, you know, commuter living and trying to cut on vehicular. I think we even have an approved variance to like reduce the parking.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think the last point is this walk ... the retaining walls on your site are in really rough shape. This is the one that is part of the stair, as well as the one that goes ...

Ms. Magliano: You're talking about the front retaining wall, with the existing stair.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right. That will need to be replaced, and is not looked at.

Ms. Magliano: Correct.

Boardmember Sullivan: So we need to think about that and how that impacts those stairs, as well.

Ms. Magliano: Right. I know in the very beginning the owner had mentioned that he'd be willing to do some form of like improvements or enhancements on the existing stair. And obviously that retaining wall is part of it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: At some point we need to see those details.

Ms. Magliano: Okay.

Boardmember Sullivan: I don't know where your stakes are – and this is my last point – but I think the small stakes are ...

Ms. Magliano: They're for flagpoles out in the ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Where are they on this plan?

Ms. Magliano: They are actually located where the building starts. They're not inclusive of the porch. And recently I think Matt went out and taped out the outline of the porch just for clarification.

Boardmember Sullivan: What I would propose is that I think on the side where the bike storage is that actually will be ... is that where the post is, or is that post on the side where the porch ends?

Ms. Magliano: I believe it's on the side where the porch ends.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, we need to know for sure.

Ms. Magliano: Okay.

Boardmember Sullivan: Because I think that's quite prominent, and if it's going to be as tall as the building, you know, there may be ways we want to pull back the terrace where the bike storage is and make it be less intrusive.

Ms. Magliano: I think that's lower. I think it's set at the same height as a terrace, but I can ...

Boardmember Sullivan: I meant more making it shorter. Not having it aligned with the front of the building, but pulling it back so the terrace doesn't go all the way to the front of the building. It's sort of pulled back, say, 10 feet.

Chairman O'Reilly: And less bicycles.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, I think that whole area can be looked at. I mean, I think the bikes actually ... that whole side is ...

Ms. Magliano: Oh, no, not pull it down in height. Pull it back.

Boardmember Sullivan: That whole area I feel is actually not that helpful for the residents. And I think as we look at ways to maybe not have as much sort of grading and walls being built that maybe that area doesn't have ... if it doesn't have a door to the storage, people's bikes go back to the rear of the building. You know, you kind of re-look at that area where the storage and the laundry room and the building services are. There are many ways that we ... we might not want that terrace to be right in people's faces as they come up and down that stair.

Again, when we see the drawings with elevations and slopes and things that'll be easier to determine. But there's a lot of room in that sort of zone to maybe move things around. Thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Very good. Thank you.

Also know, and I've mentioned to you informally already, just for the record the page that was labeled A-201.00 the drawings are correct in that they are proposed south and west elevations. But on the pages themselves it's laying north and east where, in fact, they are south and west. The drawings are correct.

Ms. Magliano: Underneath, yeah.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The title block doesn't match.

Ms. Magliano: Yeah, the titles are incorrect. We can adjust that.

Chairman O'Reilly: Do we have any other comments? Any other questions?

Boardmember Alligood: Yes. I think Kathy's feedback was really helpful. I'll just say, kind of taking a long view of this project which has come before us many times – and I've said this many times – I'm supportive of density in our downtown and I like this project because it does include affordable housing. I think that's really great. So that's why I have been supportive from day one. And even having reduced parking.

But it's got to this stage where now I'm concerned about just its bulkiness. And the design is just not – I don't want to say "fitting in" because I'm not somebody who says it has to look like every old house around it – modern, and it's not fitting with the role of really sweet houses that kind of all fit together. So I think there's something about the treatment of the building missing. It's almost like it's a little bit of different styles going on and they're not coming together. It's a very massive building. Really, it's looking very massive right now and very close to the street.

I'm not going to sit here and give you tons of design advice because you guys are design

professionals. But having looked at lots of projects, I feel like this one just needs more work. Just in terms of how the façade is treated, I think Kathy made some good points. I think some of the reduction of entrances, the porches and terraces not quite making sense. So I'll leave it at that.

Ms. Magliano: Okay. I know we did try to maintain like similar materials to maintain the colors and fabric on what's happening on the existing street. And I know I think we expect some of the same material that's used on, I think that's Rockwood & Perry.

Boardmember Alligood: I guess I'm just not understanding where the treatment of the banisters is coming from. It's like New Orleans or something.

Chairman O'Reilly: Continuous.

Boardmember Alligood: It's just not coming together for me.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: And I would have to second what Eva's saying. It seems a little bit of a mix-up of different styles. I don't know, something.

Ms. Magliano: Something more simple and clean.

Boardmember Alligood: I think we have the reaction, if it weren't, it's going to be very prominent. Like it's going to be a signature building in our village and so a little more thought would be helpful.

Chairman O'Reilly: Very good. Kerry, anything?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: No, I'm done.

Chairman O'Reilly: This is a public hearing so do we have anyone from the public to speak in relation to this project? If not, in terms of the view preservation, obviously you've kept the building relatively low, obviously. And we do have foliage around it. Am I the only one who thinks we need anything more in regard to the view preservation, or are we satisfied with that part of it?

Boardmember Sullivan: I just think not really knowing where the elevations are and the site and the building it seems like it's headed in the right direction. It doesn't seem like it's a big intrusion, but I don't really know where this building relates to things that are around it quite yet.

Boardmember Alligood: The other point is that I don't think we should factor in vegetation because we don't know exactly how many trees are coming down, how that's going to impact

the views. There's a lot to that.

Ms. Magliano: I believe we are taking down three mature trees.

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, it's mostly on the corner.

Ms. Magliano: Because they were in conflict with the location of the retaining walls.

Chairman O'Reilly: Northwest?

Boardmember Alligood: Those are massive trees and they create almost like a forested look. So when they come down, the building will be very visible. And I'm not actually now nodding and commenting on view preservation because that's looking up, but I just think that kind of information factors into the various things we're looking at.

Chairman O'Reilly: All right, work to be done.

Ms. Magliano: Thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you. Our next item on the agenda are new public hearings, first of which is accessory apartment approval application of Linda Osborn.

IV. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Accessory Apartment Approval – Application of Linda Osborn – 17 Villard Avenue – 4.40-27-44. No waivers required.

Chairman O'Reilly: This is a reapplication of an existing accessory apartment. Please introduce yourself.

Linda Osborn, applicant: I own the home at 17 Villard Avenue with the accessory apartment that we're discussing.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, there's no waivers required so it has been existing. This is a three-year renewal?

Ms. Osborn: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: We have actually had a letter with a question, two questions, which I think I should mention and indicate for the record because it requires a response from you on this.

One of the questions raised – and this is a letter from Lee Kinnally at 44 Villard Avenue – is that there is a requirement that the owner occupy one of the dwellings as a principal residence as part of the code, section 295-76d(b.1).

Ms. Osborn: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: And so the question would be do you testify, or indicate, that this is your primary residence and that you are an occupant of this?

Ms. Osborn: Yes, it is my primary residence. I pay the mortgage and the heating bill and – I don't know – the electric bill. For many years I've had someone live with me on and off. Right now I have a small family that lives with me. I had a gentleman live with me for a while, but they're not a tenant. I just like someone in the house.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But is it your primary residence?

Ms. Osborn: Yes, it is. I do have a place in the city that I sleep sometimes, but I do come here and take care of my garden and take care of my house, and so forth and so on.

Chairman O'Reilly: Does primary residence imply living there full-time?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Majority of the time. I mean, it's like for your taxes.

Ms. Osborn: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: So you would indicate you are there the majority of the time and this is your primary residence.

Ms. Osborn: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: That's question number one. Now, I don't know how we indicate this one, section 295-67. You've indicated that there are other people there, and, *"it shall not be permitted in a residence – provides an accessory apartment shall not be ...* I'm sorry. The main residence appears to have one or more renters, boarders or roomers, but you've indicated who does live there.

Ms. Osborn: They don't pay me anything.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So they wouldn't be considered renters, boarders or roomers if they're not paying.

Chairman O'Reilly: Non-paying.

Boardmember Alligood: Cohabitants.

Village Attorney Whitehead: They're part of their ...

Male Voice: Household.

Ms. Osborn: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: Then you've answered both questions. As far as the application goes, Buddy ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I can read the report into the record. *"On our inspection, there has been no changes to this accessory apartment since the last inspection, we have not received any complaints – until this letter – "by this office in the last three years. It is code compliant and there are no waivers required, and it does have off-street parking."*

Chairman O'Reilly: Any questions in relation to the letter and the application? Anyone else from the public to speak on this, attending for that reason?

Okay, then I will give this to include this with the record, Buddy. Oh, you have that. Therefore, I ask for a motion to approve the application for renewal of the accessory apartment of Ms. Linda Osborn at 17 Villard Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson.

On MOTION of Boardmember Gould-Schmit, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood , with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved to approve the application for renewal of the accessory apartment of Ms. Linda Osborn at 17 Villard Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson.

Boardmember Sullivan: Thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Our next public hearing is for site plan approval on the application of Hastings Landing Homeowners Corporation.

2. **Site Plan Approval – Application of Hastings Landing Homeowners Corp. for an amendment to a previously-approved site plan application for change of the previously-approved traffic pattern. Said property is located in the R-10 (Cluster Zone Overlay) Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.100-95-28 on the Village Tax Maps.**

Chairman O'Reilly: Mr. Petretti, I guess you're here to speak on this issue. Could you just indicate the previously-approved traffic pattern and the way in which this changes from that previously-approved traffic pattern? And even though I've said your name, could you introduce yourself when ready?

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's just a traffic pattern on one little section.

Chairman O'Reilly: We all have them.

Boardmember Sullivan: I volunteer mine for the public if they want to put it up someplace.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I doubt any public is here for this.

Chairman O'Reilly: Is there anyone from the public wants to look at this traffic pattern?

Boardmember Sullivan: Oh, that looks pretty. Be very careful of what you have on your desktop.

Paul Petretti, civil engineer: About a year ago I became ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: You have to speak into the mic, Paul. Even without the computer you have to speak into the mic.

Mr. Petretti: I'm a land surveyor representing Hastings Landing Homeowners group. About a year ago – last fall, I believe – I came before you and we had site plan approval. What we did, my part of it, was to rebuild a retaining wall on an arc coming in. Quite simply, when you come in off Broadway you make a left-hand turn. That road went down, then loops around in a 180-degree turn.

Formerly, they made a left-hand turn to come in. They would like to revise that. They feel it's a lot safer, and I do, too. As you come around that curve, UPS trucks and everything are dropping a grade in a very tight radius of 30 feet; about 11 or 12 feet. So it's about a 12 percent grade. What they'd like to do is no longer make a left-hand turn, make that exit-only, and then entrance on the lower half of the 180-degree turn. That's basically what they really want to do.

Chairman O'Reilly: So it's really just a change of direction, no construction, no nothing.

Mr. Petretti: Some signage, a little bit of signage.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Which they're dealing with ARB. That's on a separate application with ARB.

Boardmember Sullivan: The signs?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yes.

Mr. Petretti: So what you have there, the yellow is post, and the magenta ...

Chairman O'Reilly: Is the old way. So everything moves in a clockwise direction now – anti-clockwise direction.

Mr. Petretti: They're going to have a sign. When you get down to the lower units and come through the curve, when you come up that curve we would like UPS and FedEx and everybody to come out and exit from the top lane. They still will allow two-way traffic. There's three sets of units so they want to keep some two-way.

Chairman O'Reilly: I don't have any questions. We all think it makes perfect sense. I think we can save you any further worry. I guess we need a motion to approve.

Boardmember Sullivan: Anyone from the public?

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, I asked that before and nobody wanted one of these.

Boardmember Sullivan: Excuse me, I forgot.

Chairman O'Reilly: But just to confirm, there is no one from the public to speak on this issue. Fine. Therefore, we need a motion to approve the application of Hastings Landing Homeowners Corp. for an amendment to a previously-approved site plan, as indicated in the diagram and representation presented to us.

On MOTION of Boardmember Sullivan, SECONDED by Boardmember Gould-Schmit, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved to approve the application of Hastings Landing Homeowners Corp. for an amendment to a previously-approved site plan, as indicated in the diagram and representation presented to us.

Chairman O'Reilly: Unanimous, thank you.

Mr. Petretti: Thank you, too.

Chairman O'Reilly: The next application is site plan approval application of Mary Wilson.

3. Site Plan Approval – Application of Mary Wilson for demolition to the foundation of the existing building at the commercial property located at 623 Warburton Avenue. Said property is in the C-O Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-21-2 on the Village Tax Maps.

Chairman O'Reilly: We have received material on this, and we have ...

Michael Lewis, representing owners: Andrew and Mary Wilson were planning to present this, but they had a death in the family and they had to fly to Ireland. They can't be here, they asked me to step in and represent them. Apologies for not having this up on the screen. I just had short notice to put it together.

The project is very simple in concept. The old engineering building is suffering. There's no insulation in the walls, it leaks, they haven't been able to rent it for quite a while now. It was poorly built, in 1965, and it's gotten more so since. It was an odd thing that it was built in the first place. Originally that was on a residential lot that was rezoned for that one commercial building. Really, it's an anomaly in that location. It probably wouldn't be allowed to occur today.

It's fairly massive and broad and blocks the view from Broadway as you're coming down the hill. But for the Wilsons, it's basically in their backyard. This is their house – they own both lots – and it looms up over their house. They're thinking that they would probably like to develop the lot residentially in the future, however that's not part of this application. It's really not up for consideration.

What they want to do now is take down this building, which is inevitably going to come down, in my opinion, anyhow. Basically, just plant sod and have it enlarged to an open backyard. They do want to put a fence around it just to protect it, but it's as simple as that.

Chairman O'Reilly: What sort of a fence? That's part of our concern at the moment as to what sort of a fence. But it will be an open lot, in effect.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: We know the building and I realize why it's coming down, although my doctor was in there many, many years ago.

Mr. Lewis: Andrew told me they've been trying to find someone to rent it for a medical office. But no way, Jose.

Chairman O'Reilly: So the demolition is all that's being asked for at this particular point.

And the question would be what does that raise for us as a planning board: simply that we would be concerned what it would look like afterwards and what the fence would look like. But that would be part of another application, I would imagine. Am I correct?

Boardmember Alligood: I don't think (off-mic).

Village Attorney Whitehead: For a fence? Not site plan.

Boardmember Alligood: That wouldn't come back to us.

Chairman O'Reilly: That won't come back to us. Well, it'd be nice to not have a big fence along Warburton Avenue, even if that is ugly. Not, I'm not saying it's ugly. I'm sorry. *You* said it was ugly.

Mr. Lewis: Did I? I didn't use such strong language.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Not those words. You didn't use that word.

Chairman O'Reilly: No, you didn't.

Mr. Lewis: Personally, I ...

Chairman O'Reilly: You said it was badly constructed.

Mr. Lewis: You know, I feel bad about tearing it down because it's so much material that's just going to get thrown away.

Chairman O'Reilly: I didn't mean to insult the building.

Mr. Lewis: I've walked through the building and it's ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's in bad shape.

Mr. Lewis: ... just in such poor shape. And it wasn't done very well to begin with.

Chairman O'Reilly: Right, that is what you said.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Buddy, is a 6-foot fence allowed along the street frontage?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Mm-hmm.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Along the street?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: It's allowed on ... it would be on Warburton.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: There is no ... we have no provisions in our code about where the fence height is reduced or anything like that, like other towns and villages.

Boardmember Sullivan: We don't have a change ...

Boardmember Alligood: We talked about it. I think I'm the only one left on the board who was part of that conversation because somebody put up a fence that a whole bunch of neighbors were not happy with and there was a whole lot of discussion about changing ...

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I walk by it all the time. I did wonder how that got out.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: He was mayor at the time. I remember those situations.

Boardmember Alligood: Yes, a lot of discussion and nothing was done about it.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: And I've always been an advocate of 4 feet from the front of the building forward, but that's not what our code says.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And along the street, I think the issue here is 6 feet, solid fence, along Warburton.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Well, it's along the sidewalk just like the neighbor's fence is already 6 feet along the sidewalk. And it's brand-new.

Boardmember Alligood: Those fences along Broadway, they all have those big fences.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: This one would be definitely more forward, yes.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I would just say I walk by that fence on Euclid all the time, and I will say as a pedestrian it's not a pleasant experience.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: No, it's not.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: So especially this sidewalk is ... I mean, lots of people walk down the street to the train station. Am I reading it right – 8-foot wood fence? I'm reading 6 and 8.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Well, 8 feet allowed by right. As-of-right, it would have to go to the zoning board. But 6 foot 6 would be allowed.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: 6 foot 6; I would just ask if they consider along Warburton something.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Lower fences.

Mr. Lewis: I think these people are extremely tuned in to the neighborhood. I can't really speak for them because we haven't talked about that, but I think they would certainly not want to do something that was objectionable on Warburton.

Boardmember Sullivan: This project reminds me of the garage that was renovated on Warburton. Eva, you remember that project? Right by the Quarry Trail there was an old ... and I think we heard that they were reusing the structure and never really got an engineer's point to sort of show that it could be reused. I think it was rebuilt pretty much in place.

This doesn't have a proposal for a new use except potentially something down the road. I don't know, I appreciate your expertise, Michael in going through the building. But if this was an application to do a demolition, it would be interesting to get a report on whether it could be reused in some fashion. To the point you make about the amount of energy that's embodied in this building, and the fact that buildings like this all around New York – which are much taller have the side removals and good energy efficient additions made – this may not be big enough to warrant all that. It's a fairly small building.

It made me think that at some point an evaluation of keeping, or even removing, an existing structure might be something we'd be interested in. Not in this job, not in this project. I say that because this is very clear there's the question asked what will be coming next. The question is nothing but a yard at this point and maybe hope of rezoning down the road to residential.

I think, personally, every pocket of commercial is a very good thing in our community because it is a very good thing for our taxes. So I'm sad to see this go as a source of some kind of nonresidential kind of evaluation in our community, but nonetheless I don't know the history of why it was this odd site and maybe the only commercial office building zoning in this area.

Mr. Lewis: Well, what I've heard was that in 1965 the owner of the residence, which was really the forward part of it, sold off half of the lot. And, one way or another, it was residential and it was rezoned commercial. They built the commercial building, and the person at the same time left Hastings. So they sold off the lot as they were leaving, and you said it's a good thing they left because everybody was up in arms about that.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Whitehead: It was also right on the street then because the street configuration was different. Broadway went straight in and it was actually an island rather than the little park that there was there then. There was a triangle, and it was an island. So this building was actually, not to provide too much history, again ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Please do, since you grew up here.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Whitehead: And I grew up right up the street. But yes, that was actually an island. So the street was actually right in front of this building. I think that might have been part of ... they were trying to make it more a part of the downtown, and with the office building on Spring.

Boardmember Alligood: Well, I'll just say I have gone by that building many times and wondered why it was there because it just does not fit, it's a horrible building, and I'm not sad to see it go. I'm a preservationist, I'm somebody who likes to repurpose old buildings and all that. But this, I don't see much reason to keep this building.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the thing that was interesting, and it never occurred to me, similarly I drove by this building a thousand times at least and I never really thought about what it was blocking. But then after talking with Andrew and thinking about it, it's like, oh, there's really not much behind it. You'll probably see to the cliffs. That's also a nice thing.

Whether that view opens up more, or less, I'm not sure. But the next time you're there, if you look at it and try to suss it out, you'll see that it probably will provide something much nicer to see than what's there now.

Chairman O'Reilly: Very good. Any further issues? No, from us? Anyone from the public to speak on this one? If not, then I ask for a motion to approve the requested application of Mary Wilson for the demolition to the foundation of the existing building at 623 Warburton Avenue.

Boardmember Sullivan: I'm so sad to see it go, but yes I'll second it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Eva's not.

[laughter]

On MOTION of Boardmember Alligood, SECONDED by Boardmember Sullivan, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved to approve the application of Mary Wilson for

the demolition to the foundation of the existing building at 623 Warburton Avenue.

Chairman O'Reilly: Approved unanimously.

Mr. Lewis: Great.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you very much, appreciate it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So much for the 60's.

Chairman O'Reilly: That's right.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Thank you, sir.

Chairman O'Reilly: We do have a busy night, but let's move along. View preservation advisory and steep slopes approval application of Gabriel and Katalin Ce.

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

Chairman O'Reilly: I see we have a presentation, an application. We have had some material here. We also have a review of this by Mr. Cleary, who had an opportunity to look at this property. I think we know it; this is probably another building with a bit of history in the Village, too. You're speaking on this matter? Introduce yourself and your affiliation. Thank you.

Gabriel Ce, applicant: I'm the owner of the property. Sorry, I'm just trying to connect my computer.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Everybody's having technical difficulties tonight.

Mr. Ce: I'm having trouble connecting.

Chairman O'Reilly: You wouldn't be the only one tonight.

Mr. Ce: All right, I can try to do it in the dark. You have my drawings?

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, we do.

Mr. Ce: It's just not working. I apologize.

The project consists of the removal of a crumbling concrete patio in the back, some more retaining wall, following some grading for the construction of, roughly, a thousand gross square foot addition to the house, in two tiers, that consists of four railroad tied (*sic*) retaining walls on the side. The railroad tied (*sic*) retaining walls are limited to 3 foot 6 on height, and they are paired together to become some sort of terrace for us.

Just to reintroduce myself, as I've been in front of this board a few years ago for a retaining wall project we did in our house, that was kind of phase one. Since then we've been, you know, putting our effort to fix the house – repair mostly, concentrating on the side of the house – that has been neglected for the last 60 years. That's our phase two and, hopefully, the last phase of our project.

This house was built in 1917. It was a two-family house when it was built by the owner of 1 Pinecrest back then. It was built as a two-family – an income-source – house, and was rented for two families for most of its life. Until the '50s, when the previous owner bought the house from the original owner.

Back then, two families could comfortably live in the house. Each unit is about 700 square feet. I was able to source through the Library of Congress – through records of the census – and there has always been families with two kids in each of those apartments. For today's living standards it might not be as common as it used to be. My family is currently growing and we need more space. At the same rate that our family is growing, our property tax is growing. So we can't really get rid of our tenants. That's why we are looking at ways to build an addition to our property, since we have lot coverage that we could use.

You can see from the drawings you have in front of you, it's a combination of planning board and zoning board; that this project will require some variance for the zoning board. We investigated a few options on where to place the addition and concluded the best place in terms of minimizing view preservation issues was to tuck the addition in the back of the house.

You see that I have a few studies showing public experience from Old Croton Aqueduct views before and after the addition, the same as if someone is descending from Pinecrest Drive. I have a view from 1 Pinecrest with our neighbor in the back, and also a view from Warburton. I used pictures taken in the winter so there is no foliage to disguise any blockage of river view. But you might see that the renderings prove that the addition is not really interfering with river views from any public experience around it, or our neighbors'.

In terms of steep slopes, as this project is disturbing the steep slopes, our overall site is about

8,600 square feet. Out of this 8-thousand, 5,882 exceeds 25 percent on grade. And we are permanently disturbing, with this project, 1,234, which is, we think, the maximum allowed by the code. So 25%, we are permanently disturbing about 21%. There will be some disturbance beyond that mostly for, you know, excavation for footings and water runoff treatment that is going to be underground. But the idea is that we're going to put that back once the project is concluded.

Speaking about the water retainage, our engineer made a ... and you have his report, I'm just going to run through the numbers he gave us. He calculated, based on a 100-year storm event – which is 9 inches on his storm model – that changing volume from the permeable area we have right now to the impermeable portion of the addition we are adding will change the volume to 2,306 gallons of water. To mitigate that, we will be installing four of those CULTEC recharger chambers underground. Each one of those can hold up to 593 gallons. So multiple by four, it gets us over what we need: 2,372.

In addition to this, we are adding two of those FlowWell catch basins that will add our water retainage in our site up to 2,596, which is almost 300 more than what we need from a 100-year storm. I want to emphasize that because we really take stormwater retention in our site seriously. A rain like today, in our eroding steep hill that we live in, just brought mud and soil all over our patio. So we want to make sure that this project will cure that.

I think that's all, unless the board has questions for something that I didn't cover.

Chairman O'Reilly: No, I'm sure we will though have questions. I'll pass at the moment.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: A comment. I don't believe we had paper copies of this application, it was just electronic. There's a lot to it, so I think in the future ... you probably were advised that electronic is enough, but for me, trying to ... all of those details ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Two-family houses, we don't ask them to give copies of paper anymore.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I'm just giving the comment that with the amount of information he just provided that trying to study that all on a screen it's not as easy to take it all in. So that's just my comment.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: That's fine.

Boardmember Alligood: I know we've tried to reduce paper, but you put a lot of effort into a lot of pieces.

Chairman O'Reilly: There is a lot.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Buddy, has Hahn reviewed the stormwater?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Because of the major variances that are required in this we didn't want to use up Hahn's resources at this point in time. After our discussion and the recommendation, it may be advantageous to send this to the ZBA first because of the massive ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Large.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: ... large variances that are being requested on this project. Again, we didn't want to waste resources.

Chairman O'Reilly: Right. This is one where, Patrick, you had the opportunity to review and presented a couple of questions and issues, which you may not have had the opportunity to see. So, Patrick, would you like to just ...

Planning Consultant Cleary: Yes. The primary issue with this, I look at it first and foremost from a steep slope permit issue. There really isn't a better location to minimize the steep slope impact. He needs variances for this, in any event, but there's not a way to sort of relocate the building addition to minimize those steep slope impacts. And that's the primary concern of the steep slope provisions in your ordinance. So there's really no way around this. This is a take it or leave it kind of a steep slope permit application, and view preservation sort of falls in as the next issue with respect to that.

So to your point, Kerry, the plans were difficult for me. You have an elevation that shows you're not exceeding the height of the existing building, but I think the rendering wasn't that clear. So I think the elevation is confirming the fact that you're not exceeding the height.

Mr. Ce: That's right.

Planning Consultant Cleary: So that's important to note. The one comment about how this is being (off-mic) sort of mimic the existing wall of the building. Does that provide benefit in terms of view preservation? I don't know if it does, but it doesn't minimize steep slope (off-mic). So, again, I think this winds up being a take it or leave it kind of an application. That means, with the point that Buddy raised earlier, it's all about the zoning board in this case.

Boardmember Sullivan: I guess I would ask, I don't know if you've done a percolation test to see if you can use the underground stormwater containment ...

Mr. Ce: That hasn't been done yet. The engineer based it on historical data from the area,

but the actual site hasn't been tested for it.

Boardmember Sullivan: I don't know how much rock is in that area. That may be your big issue.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: When we get down to Hahn doing his review, he's going to require a perc test on this site before it would be approved.

Planning Consultant Cleary: But even with the slope, Kathy, I think there'll be more retainage in those tanks than percolation out of those tanks, just given the nature of the site.

Chairman O'Reilly: And when does Hahn come into it? Before it goes to Zoning?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Normally it would go to Hahn while it was at Zoning, but as I said earlier maybe we want to go to Zoning first on this one.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just because of the significant variances. If they're not going to grant them, the whole thing is going to change.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: And we certainly don't want to waste our resources or the applicant's. One, because he has an escrow account that's going to be paying for Hahn's services. And if the whole project changes it kind of just gets scrapped.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, right.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Okay, would you just identify the variances you need; side yard, rear yard?

Mr. Ce: Side and rear yard, yeah.

Boardmember Sullivan: So I guess do we want to give any thoughts about this application before he moves on to Zoning, or are we not at that point?

Chairman O'Reilly: Is it going to come back to us after Zoning?

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Yes, it would.

Chairman O'Reilly: It will, okay. Yes, maybe make some comments? Do we have any?

Boardmember Sullivan: Not particularly, I just thought I'd ask.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Whitehead: You can make comments if you have any.

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, we don't need SEQRA. You said that at the end no SEQRA review required, it's type two. Kerry, you have any comments?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: No. I mean, I feel for ... like I live on a very steep slope, as well, and it's hard to navigate. I mean, view preservation I don't actually think you're going to have ... I guess we'll see more, but that doesn't seem to me to be the bigger concern.

Chairman O'Reilly: Nor to me. I know that, having been into the properties when it was on the market a couple of times, you lay out there what you're trying to do, as a challenge. There's no doubt. But view preservation I don't see as an issue, given the slope that you have.

Mr. Ce: I think, just to add to that, we did explore several options on how we can add this area we need. And this is really the best way in terms of view preservation. But as, I think, Linda and Charles were saying, it really pushes our variance to a certain degree. Well, we'll have a conversation with the zoning board and see how it goes.

The other opportunities on conforming the addition, we think the setbacks that the zoning ordinance requires puts more pressure on the view preservation, and also makes the addition connection to the existing house less than functional because you are putting it on the side and it's very limited to where you can add. So, I mean, this will probably be discussed with the zoning board, but we did look at several options. I just want to throw that out.

Planning Consultant Cleary: And one minor comment, Bill. That they're proposing railroad tie retaining walls, in a case with a very steeply sloping like this that might not be the most durable solution for a retaining wall.

Mr. Ce: And we are aware of that. I think, from a budget perspective, we would love to put stone as we have done our with first wall. We want to make sure that the green corridor we have that connects the Croton Aqueduct to Warburton remains as natural as possible. So I'm trying to fight on not putting in prefab materials. And I'm aware that the railroad ties, in 15, 20 years I will have to replace. But I just want to make sure that that keeps the natural look that the neighborhood has.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes. Well, those railroad ties do rot over time no matter how pressure treated they are.

Planning Consultant Cleary: I think you'd want to hear from Hahn and see what their thoughts are.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, their thoughts as well. But that would be one of the questions for Hahn.

The only other comment I have has nothing to do with this, but it's just a pet peeve of mine. I was looking for your house. I mean, I know the house to look at, but I don't know the number. And it took me hours looking at it; it took me awhile to look at your number because the number 280 is black-on-black.

Mr. Ce: No, it's a cutout.

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, that's why I couldn't see it.

[laughter]

It didn't stand out is all I'm saying.

Village Attorney Whitehead: 9-1-1, for emergency purposes.

Chairman O'Reilly: To me, numbering is very important – to be visible. Anyway, that's what I do. Any other comments at this point?

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I mean, I would just say the railroad tie thing I would be interested to hear. I mean, I don't know that you'd get 15 or 20 years out of it. It's a pretty steep slope and there's a lot of pressure, so I do think that would be something we should ...

Mr. Ce: Sorry, but this is something from a homeowner's point. I know the cost of things and how soon I'm going to have to replace, but our engineer also encouraged us to keep the height below 4 feet. That's why we're not building to 6 feet, we are building four that are limited to 3 foot 6. That takes some of the pressure, and really adding drainage behind the pressure to get the water out of there. There's ways you can engineer the system to last longer but, yeah, we'll hear what Hahn has to say about that.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I mean, otherwise I would probably ... I'd be fine moving it to Zoning and see where we land.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: That's the reason we dual-noticed this particular project because we had a feeling that we were going to be going to the ZBA a little bit sooner than usual. So if that's what you choose, they are noticed for next week.

Chairman O'Reilly: So we can leave it at that point.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: So we just need to refer it to them.

Chairman O'Reilly: That's our action, to refer it to Zoning. That's all we need say. Very good, good luck.

Mr. Ce: Thank you.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Did you ask if there was any public?

Chairman O'Reilly: Oh, was there any comment from the public on this particular application? I guess then I know which one the public are going to be talking about.
[laughter]

Village Attorney Whitehead: We know what they're all here for.

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

Chairman O'Reilly: Mr. Weinstein, I see you're here to speak on behalf of this project, as the architect.

Edward Weinstein, project architect: The first question is, does the computer work or will we use the board?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: No, it should work. It worked on my laptop.

Mr. Weinstein: Okay, I do have ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: It worked for the first application.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Oh, are you on the laptop again?

Mr. Weinstein: Yeah, please.

Chairman O'Reilly: We'll give you a couple of minutes to get set up. We are approaching this item, which is the site plan approval and view preservation advisory application of 15 Spring Street Realty, LLC.

Chairman O'Reilly: I know I've said your name, but would you please introduce yourself and your position?

Mr. Weinstein: I'm an architect and planner with an office on Spring Street, and I am representing this evening 15 Spring Street Realty LLC. The principal is Frank Sinatra, Jr., who is here tonight in case any questions should come up that he can answer. And I'm also here with my associate, Sonja Idelson, who is the project manager for this project.

While this is booting up, what we have ... do I need the microphone?

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, please.

Mr. Weinstein: Okay. And in case this doesn't boot up, the property is on Spring Street, about 50 feet west of Warburton Avenue. It's currently a funeral home which is not used very frequently, although it is still used. Mr. Sinatra would like to ... he's got other funeral homes in the region that he will use. He'd like to close this facility, demolish it, and build this new mixed-use building, which you've described will have parking. It will have two rather small retail spaces – commercial spaces – and six residential units.

Buddy, you think we'll be able to get this? Okay, so ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: You just have to find where ... I have no idea where the flash drive is.

Chairman O'Reilly: Go to the window in the bottom left, I think.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, it should pop right up.

Chairman O'Reilly: Go to the bottom left window.

Mr. Weinstein: No, I see that. Okay, here we go, USB drive. There we go. We'll try a PDF, that might be easier.

Chairman O'Reilly: Maybe you can minimize the front screen, or front window.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You have to stop whatever's in the back.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It's behind the front screen.

Mr. Weinstein: Is it?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: You got to minimize the screen. There you are.

Mr. Weinstein: Okay, there we go.

Okay, so what you're looking at here ... might as well take down the board blocking your view. It's situated right between, I think, 565 Warburton, which is under construction, and 7 Spring Street, which is the building that has Food For Thought. Our building will be ... I guess the important thing is, it's fully compliant with zoning.

Chairman O'Reilly: "X" that out.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Just X out of that.

Mr. Weinstein: Got it. This is the survey of the property. There are no steep slopes on it. It does slope from north to south – north is high, south is low – on Spring Street. There's a photograph of the context, but I'm sure you're all very familiar with it.

This is a sheet that we did prepare at the request of Mr. Minozzi which provides the calculations for the building height. It's new in your folders. Basically, we divide the lot into thirds from east to west and from north to south and we come up with an average height. The building height limit is 40 feet, and we are within that building envelope as far as height. So, compliant with height.

I'll get to view preservation in a moment, but basically the floor plan. The lower level, we're going to have to excavate to create 10 parking spaces which are required parking spaces. So this is the first floor and will have the building entrance for the residence, with an elevator, a small lobby, some mechanical space, and storage spaces for the tenants. The lower level, as you can see, will basically use the existing curb cut which enters from Spring Street. It will have a ramp down where we have 10 parking spaces, which is what is required under the zoning.

The second and third floors are sort of identical, each one has three residential units. And we'd like to explore the possibility of adding some green features to this building. So in addition to complying with the Hastings green code we will explore the possibility of putting in some solar panels. In fact, you can see from the rendering that we've sort of added a mansard element which faces due south. So we'll have solar panels there and some additional solar panels. We'll see if we can get a green roof in to reduce somewhat the stormwater.

We're not increasing any impermeable surface. The site is fully impermeable right now between the current building and the asphalt parking lot. In discussions with Buddy, we did not bring in a civil engineer at this point although we're comfortable that we'll be able to deal with the stormwater either with a Village sewer in Spring Street – there's a storm sewer in Spring Street – or with retainage on-site. But we'll get to that in the next phase. There is what I would consider a minor view preservation issue, and ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I just want to speak to that real quick. The applicant did ask me for a waiver on view preservation, but there was a minor obstruction in the view so we have to go through with a full view preservation.

Chairman O'Reilly: From what direction is the view?

Mr. Weinstein: If you're standing in front of the hardware store looking sort of northwest, there is a space – this corner, at the corner of the building – that partially blocks. And we're not even sure if it blocks the river and the Palisades; it certainly blocks a small piece of sky.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I believe it was the Palisades. It was a sliver of the Palisades that was being blocked. Not the river, it's too high up.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, too high up for that.

Mr. Weinstein: But it's certainly not a view that people stand at that location. You know, you could stand in the park, the VFW park, and look at the river down Spring Street. From a design point of view, we've tried very hard to be consistent with the Village's commercial district design guidelines and feel that we have kept in harmony with the scale, character, and proportion. Most buildings in the downtown are three-story buildings with retail and residential above, as is our building. Our building is a little wider than most buildings so we've added vertical masonry elements to try to break that up.

Any questions?

Boardmember Sullivan: Could you do a favor? Would you walk us through the floor plans?

Mr. Weinstein: Sure.

Boardmember Sullivan: That would be helpful.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I was just going to ask about the first floor plan.

Boardmember Sullivan: First, second, third, fourth.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: Well, yes. Particularly the retail floor.

Chairman O'Reilly: A-100?

Boardmember Sullivan: You mentioned, talked about ... do you want to start at the driveway and the first floor, and talk about that?

Mr. Weinstein: Yeah. So the driveway, the ramp leading down is in this location, pretty much where the present curb cut is. We kept it at that location because there's a large pole west of that driveway that has a lot of equipment – telephone, electrical, cable – and it would have been, I think, rather difficult to try and relocate that equipment.

As I said, the rest of that lower level is parking. The upper level has, really, a pedestrian entrance to the parking at this point, and a platform which is at the same level – at sidewalk level – where the occupants of the building and the clients of the retail spaces could enter. So the one retail space right here is about 700 square feet. There's another one here on the west side that's about – was it 13-hundred square feet? – 12- or 13-hundred square feet

Sonja Idelson, project manager: It's 17-hundred.

Mr. Weinstein: Yes, and that's the first floor. There's also, you know, as I mentioned, some small mechanical space and some tenant storage spaces.

Boardmember Alligood: Can I ask you how you envision Retail-1, the 17-hundred square foot, being used?

Mr. Weinstein: Well, it's the space that sort of after we follow the requirements of what had to go into that space that was sort of the space that was left over.

Boardmember Alligood: Well, trying to avoid the parking for the retail you broke it up into two.

Mr. Weinstein: Oh, no, no, not at all.

Boardmember Alligood: Well, there's no reason ... you could have one retail and you would surpass the threshold of the 25-hundred square feet required parking. So clearly you made a choice to break it up into two to avoid that.

Mr. Weinstein: But it would have been under 25-hundred needed.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Twenty-four hundred.

Boardmember Alligood: Twenty-four? So why are you breaking it up?

Mr. Weinstein: It may or may not get broken up. I think it would be easier to rent as two smaller spaces than as one larger space.

Chairman O'Reilly: Reasonable.

Boardmember Alligood: I'm just going to say I don't see what kind of retail use would go into it. I mean, I just want everyone to see that sliver like with a tiny kind of entrance in the front and then going way back. I'm not sure there'd be ... I guess there'd be some windows in the back.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It could be storage in the back.

Boardmember Alligood: But we have vacant retail spaces in Hastings already, so my initial comment is going to be I would advise designing spaces that you actually could imagine a use that would locate there, that could be viable. I don't see why we would build spaces that ... we can't even name a use that could possibly go in there. We know it's difficult to fill these spaces anyway. So that's just my comment.

Plus, the way that you enter that retail space is a little unusual, right? Because you're going into the building and then entering the business.

Mr. Weinstein: No, you're going onto a platform, or a horizontal area, that is accessed from the sidewalk. See, all of the other buildings on the street – you know, on a sloping street – have stairs. But under current standards we have to, and it should be, accessible for folks in wheelchairs. You'd be at the sidewalk level, you'd go straight ahead into the lobby of the building, and you'd sort of make a left turn to get to the retail spaces.

Boardmember Alligood: Inside. But where do you make that ...

Mr. Weinstein: Not inside, it's outside.

Boardmember Alligood: You're outside (cross-talk) ...

Mr. Weinstein: It's covered, but outside.

Boardmember Alligood: Okay. So you have two doors in a kind of interior setback space.

Mr. Weinstein: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Exterior, isn't it?

Mr. Weinstein: Sort of it had to be that way because of ADA issues. Otherwise, we'd have to have the first floor at several different levels of access from the street.

Boardmember Alligood: (Cross-talk) access ... you couldn't really create an entrance directly from the street to your second spot because you have ...

Mr. Weinstein: Yes.

Boardmember Alligood: ... a height problem.

Mr. Weinstein: That's right.

Boardmember Alligood: But I'm still struggling with why you would have just two spaces.

Mr. Weinstein: I have to tell you, as we get into further stages of this project, if we start marketing a spaces and there's somebody who's interested in the total space, then that may be the way to go. I think from a site plan approval and zoning perspective it really makes no difference whether it's one or two spaces.

Boardmember Alligood: Well, we're here to comment on ...

Mr. Weinstein: Sure, and I'm listening.

Boardmember Alligood: ... how this is sited. And it does matter to use whether the spaces are going to be viable. So we're going to comment on that.

Mr. Weinstein: I'm certainly not questioning it. I sat on your side of the table for 10 years.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think I want to just add something to what Eva's saying. I thought the second doorway to the retail space being at sort of right angles to the street and sort of not very visible could be a detriment to that viability. Not seeing the door to a store, maybe if you don't really know where it is and where ...

Mr. Weinstein: You're saying it won't be visible from the street? Is that your comment?

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes, I think it's not as direct as when you're in our town and come off the street right into a store. You open the door, and you're into the store. So I just wonder (cross-talk) ...

Mr. Weinstein: So this is the front elevation, and the storefronts will be visible. I mean, there'll be this low masonry wall in front of those retail spaces, but the storefronts and

whatever signage they have on them will be visible.

Boardmember Sullivan: I don't know how this would impact the inner arrangement, but I thought the lobby is sort of a space that doesn't need to be right into public view because that's going to be (cross-talk) ...

Mr. Weinstein: You mean the residential lobby. Yeah, that's ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Residential. So if there's a way that that became (cross-talk) ...

Mr. Weinstein: That's right here, where you see the "15." And that'll have a small awning over it.

Boardmember Sullivan: But that could be off to the side, and the two doors to the retail spaces could be sort of parallel to the street, potentially, if you move things around.

Mr. Weinstein: Not sure I'm following.

Boardmember Sullivan: No. The lobby doors don't have to be as visible off the street, potentially, as a retail could be: to make a retail space easy to get in and out of, making it more visible to someone walking by. So I'm just suggesting maybe as we look at this that that door itself to the lobby could be put off to the side and not be as visible as it is.

Mr. Weinstein: Right. Okay, we'll take a look at that.

Boardmember Sullivan: Sure. What's the ground floor patio for, in the back?

Mr. Weinstein: Because of the setbacks on that first floor, that's pretty much the roof of the garage, which is just there because we have to set back ... the initial setback is 10 feet, and we have to set back another 10 feet. And I'm not sure how that would be used. It certainly could be ... if one of the spaces were, say, a coffee shop it might be a little outdoor space associated with that. It's outdoor space.

Boardmember Sullivan: Is that above the grade of the parking lot to the north?

Mr. Weinstein: Well, let's look at the cross-section. You're talking about the bank parking lot?

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes. When you mentioned it was the top, the roof, of the garage I just realized – is that underground?

Mr. Weinstein: It's actually below that parking lot. This point here is the grade of the

parking lot so there would be a wall, a retaining wall, at that point. The initial setback from the rear yard has to be 10 feet.

Boardmember Sullivan: How much lower is that than the grade of the parking lot?

Mr. Weinstein: You know exactly how much lower? I think it looks like it's about 4 to 6 feet, 5 feet.

Boardmember Sullivan: What's that going to do to the neighbor to the west when that patio comes around? Where is that grade?

Mr. Weinstein: The neighbors to the west, we are building our building, you know, to the lot line. At some point in the past, that building to the west put windows on their lot line. Generally, people who put windows on their lot line don't have the protection that those buildings will exist forever, that those windows will exist forever. And so we are building ... our plan is to build to our lot line.

Boardmember Sullivan: And the configuration of that building to the west, it's a two-story building? First floor is retail, correct?

Mr. Weinstein: Yes. Retail on the ground floor, and I think there is one residential unit above.

Boardmember Sullivan: And that residential unit will lose all the windows by ...

Mr. Weinstein: Yeah, I don't know what the interior layout is so I can't say whether that is a required window or not. It's certainly an issue for that property owner.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: Could I break in with some general issues? Obviously it's important to look at the internal structure, but I was just looking through the report that Mr. Cleary prepared after his review. Have you had the opportunity to see any of this?

Mr. Weinstein: I have not.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay. Generally, these things come in before the meeting but, nonetheless, some of the general issues that I think you need to be looking at – and I would just ask Patrick to do them – and then let's get into the detail of some of these things that relate to the structure.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Yes. As Bill indicated, the building is fully zoning

compliant. He clarified the height issue, which we met with them a couple of weeks ago to deal with that issue specifically.

The garage was always tricky, and there are some pinches in the garage. There's one point where the aisle width gets pinched. If you could put that level up again, the last parking space – parking space 10 ...

Mr. Weinstein: Number 10?

Planning Consultant Cleary: ... you can't sort of back out of it. Normally, you'd have a little bit of a hammerhead. You'd have to sort of back out of there. That's an awkward spot. So if you could kind of look at that, the grades of the driveway and the slopes work. They did a good job of designing that.

So there's some pinching. And the disability issues, always columns; are there columns coming down, are they in parking spaces or adjacent to parking? So understanding that is something we'd want to look at. There is no off-street loading requirement in this zone, and how are you going to deal with that is something that becomes an issue not only from a daily basis, but tenants moving in and out. Is that something you're dealing with? There is on-street parking in front of the building. How does that sort of ...

Mr. Weinstein: The area between Warburton and Food For Thought is a no-parking zone. There's a parking meter, you know, a little bit to the west of our lot. So I guess we would get deliveries pretty much as every other business in the Village gets deliveries. They're small stores, they're not going to have semi-trailers. They'll probably have vans making the deliveries.

Planning Consultant Cleary: And just to the point we talked about earlier, the configuration of that first floor, the space we were talking about. That looks like a restaurant the way it's configured there. There's a kitchen in the back, there's a line to get into the front and get your table. That's what that sort of looks like. And as Bill indicated, that back area might support a coffee shop with tables in the rear. So that's a potential but, again, that's the applicant's choice. The question about the first floor however is, if you were to reorient the residential support space a little bit differently – to use the back instead of the front – can you reclaim square, normal-sized retail space by doing that?

Mr. Weinstein: We can certainly look at that.

Planning Consultant Cleary: This is a new building that will modify the utilities: sewer, water, and so forth. What I'd like to see is a full EAF supporting this application that talks to sewer and water and that sort of stuff.

Mr. Weinstein: Sure.

Planning Consultant Cleary: So we have a better understanding that Bill indicated: property line to property line there's not a lot of opportunity for landscaping. But one of your renderings does show some planters in the front. If that's what you're proposing, let's know about that.

Mr. Weinstein: The low wall might have some opportunity for some green.

Planning Consultant Cleary: So let's detail that.

Mr. Weinstein: Okay.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Lighting wasn't clear. There was some indication that there would be wall-mounted lights on ...

Mr. Weinstein: Sconces on the front of the building.

Planning Consultant Cleary: So detail that for us, if we could understand it a little bit better. With respect to architecture, just some description of materials and so forth as we move along. Solid waste and recycling, I don't know if you've thought about that. It didn't show a garbage room in the building. How are we dealing with that, is there a dumpster that rolls out? So some thought about that. As an afterthought, that could be a problem where we're losing a parking space to deal with that. So something to think about.

You show a mechanical room. Is anything going on the roof? If so, we'd want to know about that.

Mr. Weinstein: We hadn't contemplated anything on the roof at this stage. I'm not saying that it won't happen after we get into the mechanical engineering.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Proposing a generator for the building?

Mr. Weinstein: Excuse me?

Planning Consultant Cleary: A generator for the building?

Mr. Weinstein: I wasn't anticipating a generator.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Okay, those are the kind of little things. If it's on the roof we might have to talk about sound attenuation for your neighbors. So something to think about.

Mr. Weinstein: Mm-hmm.

Planning Consultant Cleary: We do have to discuss the issue of parkland. Your code requires that discussion to occur.

Mr. Weinstein: Payment-in-lieu.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes.

Planning Consultant Cleary: There's the answer for that, but that's a decision you have to make. The applicant is offering a solution to that.

Mr. Weinstein: That's typically at least the way the conversation has gone on previous applications.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Improvement to the sidewalk and curb. It's a little worn, it's got some ...

Mr. Weinstein: It isn't very bad. If you notice in the rendering, we fixed it.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Okay, that's the point.

Mr. Weinstein: And there's also a rather large tree towards the eastern end of our site that I think unfortunately will have to go. Just like the Warburton property removed several trees, it'll be in the way for construction. And frankly, I was around when these honey locusts were planted. There were nice little 2-inch calipers, but now they're ripping up the sidewalks.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Understand. So this might be an opportunity to replace it with more appropriate street trees?

Mr. Weinstein: I think so.

Planning Consultant Cleary: And finally, you should be commended on the green building aspects you put into the building. The obvious ones we picked up – the solar and so forth – but low-flow fixtures. If you tell us all what's going in the building that would be terrific.

Mr. Weinstein: We're doing whatever we can.

Planning Consultant Cleary: And again, if you could support this with a full EAF that would help us.

Mr. Weinstein: Okay.

Chairman O'Reilly: Finally, I know you've given us the Short Environmental Assessment Form, but the question is does this require a full EAF?

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's what Pat just asked them to provide.

Planning Consultant Cleary: I think we'd want to see that, though.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It doesn't require it, but it would be helpful.

Chairman O'Reilly: Would be helpful.

Mr. Weinstein: So yes, we will submit the full EAF next time we're here or prior to the next meeting.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay.

Boardmember Sullivan: Could we just finish going through the plans? On the second floor, do you ... what's going on in the back? Is that a large terrace off those rear apartments?

Mr. Weinstein: I'm going to let Sonja describe these units because she worked long and hard on laying them out.

Ms. Idelson: On the second floor, yes, this is a large terrace that (off-mic) first floor. We have two different (unintelligible) because we're trying to propose some green area on that terrace, plus some patio area. So we're just trying to maximize the amount of green surface to those areas because we (off-mic) provide a rear roof that people can actually walk on and just (unintelligible)).

Boardmember Sullivan: On the third floor you show doors. And in your elevation you show a balcony of some type, but I don't see it on the plan.

Ms. Idelson: No, they're really ... like in the front façade we have these balcony doors. But the balcony is really a guard so people can open the full (unintelligible).

[Male Voice] XXX: Juliette.

Village Attorney Whitehead: A Juliette.

Ms. Idelson: Yes, exactly.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, I just thought in the elevation it looked like you actually had a balcony on the back. So I guess not.

Could you explain? The second floor, there's a mezzanine section that's equal to the roof. The roof is very confusing because you have in the front ... you show solar panels and green roofs and terraces and they all seem to be on top of each other. So could you just explain what's up at the top?

Ms. Idelson: Here, the next one and the next one. Yes, I apologize for the confusion, but I guess we were trying to put too many things. So in the roof we are trying to do two things: to maximize solar panel area and to maximize green roof area. So to reach a point, some of it will make more sense than the other. So that's why we are lifting some of this coarse foliage but, again, that may be flexible based on our findings also when we got to the construction details and all that.

Planning Consultant Cleary: So will you explain the mezzanine? I think that's more confusing.

Ms. Idelson: The mezzanine? Sure. So because of the way of the topography works we have more height allowance in the center of the lot, which is mostly the back of this building.

Boardmember Sullivan: Mm-hmm.

Ms. Idelson: So we created two mezzanine areas for the two apartments, and those are less than 250, about 250, so just to comply with egress. Basically those mezzanines, they could have access to the roof. But we are still debating whether we should do that or just the roof will have access from the main staircase for the whole building. And that's something that sometimes buildings figure out how they can take turns, the neighbors to go, because of occupancy.

Boardmember Sullivan: So you have mansard solar panels in the front. Is that where you're showing the one solar panel being 170?

Ms. Idelson: Yes.

Boardmember Sullivan: And then have solar panels and a green roof and a terrace all happening between the mezzanine and the solar panels in the front. That's what confusing.

Ms. Idelson: So these will be solar panels, this will be (unintelligible) area, this will be patio area, and this is (off-mic). And on top of the mezzanine we have the second roof, the upper

roof. And we are also trying to, again, same concept, maximizing solar panels and green roof. And also (cross-talk) ...

Boardmember Sullivan: So the solar panels on the front. You have solar panels as a mansard, with a terrace.

Ms. Idelson: Yes.

Boardmember Sullivan: Then you have more solar panels that are tucked behind the solar panels?

Ms. Idelson: Yeah. So we may have to angle ... these are some things, some details, that we're still figuring out how the locations and how it makes more sense.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think we'll need to know those details.

Ms. Idelson: Yeah.

Boardmember Sullivan: And so the new spiral staircase, that's a service stair that goes up to the top.

Ms. Idelson: Yeah, just for the service for the top of the roof to have like no access to the rest of this.

Boardmember Sullivan: It'd be helpful if you sort of shade out what's behind, what's below. It would be helpful next time to sort of shade out what's below the level that you're talking about because that all kind of looks like it's at one level.

Ms. Idelson: Yeah, yeah.

Boardmember Sullivan: All right. Thank you, Bill, that was helpful. The roof was very confusing.

Chairman O'Reilly: Eva?

Boardmember Alligood: I have a question for Pat, actually, because I did read your memo. And I'm not sure you mentioned it previously, maybe I missed it, but I thought you raised a question about some of what's on that first floor where the retail is, about its ...

Planning Consultant Cleary: Right. So the code requires that to be nonresidential space. It has residential storage and a lobby. Buddy has to make a call as to whether that's considered residential space or not. There are no dwelling units on that level, but it's the

space that supports the dwelling units above.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yes. We don't count that as restaurant space or (cross-talk) ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Residential space.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: That's counted towards your residential space.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But is it considered residential that can't be on a first floor? It's not; it's not residential space, in that sense.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Right, it's not residential space where somebody can live. But unless it's serving the stores or the restaurant – whatever their commercial use is, and when they count, if it is serving that space – then we have to count it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think Pat was looking the other way.

Ms. Idelson: Actually, the code allows to have a residential space on the first floor, but it has to be in the back.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Subject to the planning board's authorization.

Boardmember Alligood: So, Pat, I just point it out because there was a kind of response like, Well, we're under the 45-hundred square feet for retail. And I don't think it's that clear-cut, I just want to point out. It's a legitimate question, and I'm not trying to force more parking on this because I don't want that. But I do want to make this point that if we're going to be a little flexible on the rules here, and we're going to make sure that the retail is under 25-hundred square feet so you guys can put retail on there without adding parking, I do think that the insistence that these spaces be designed in a way that you show what potential uses would really fit there and what you think would be marketable, I think that's reasonable. Just to make that point again.

Planning Consultant Cleary: I think what you have, Eva, is space that looks like it wants to shift and morph. And that's challenging for you. It would be much more preferential to commit to something that you know isn't going to bounce around.

Boardmember Alligood: Yes, I'd like to see. Like show us how you think something would lay out, what kind of store. If it's a café, show us what that's going to look like. And I just get the sense that it was put there a certain way to solve for other things rather than to make it usable for retail. And that matters to me, especially because it is a strange site for putting retail because you've got that sloping sidewalk and you have that issue that you're only going to be able to enter, really, from the street in one little spot. And that does create for difficult retail because you already have problems with retail anyway just trying to fill retail spaces in

Hastings. And then when you have an odd ...

Chairman O'Reilly: Shape.

Boardmember Alligood: ... shape and you don't have a connection to the sidewalk, the way most people look for and feel connected to retail, you're going to have all these cascading problems. And I just see this as like either vacant space sitting there or it's going to become an office. And I just think, coming in, it could be designed in a way where it really could be successful that would be preferable.

Ms. Idelson: I thought it could be also like a place where kids get some classes or something (off-mic) classes or ...

Mr. Weinstein: We don't have any paint-and-sit in Hastings.

[laughter]

I think there are a lot of opportunities ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Where they experience a little retail.

Mr. Weinstein: Talk with a broker and, you know, get some professional advice as to what type of retail might be most marketable. That's a good comment.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, very good.

Boardmember Sullivan: Could I say something about the street facade?

Ms. Idelson: Yes.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think Richard Bass sent an e-mail as well, and I have to second what he suggested: that having balconies to nowhere are really a problem. Juliette balconies are just something that I think are very inappropriate in our community. It reminds me of the kind of crazy condominiums that are going up all over Brooklyn right now, and I just really would advise not. I think I'd like to see them be gone. I just don't see the value of them, since there isn't an actually a space you can go out. You could have a big window, you can have the windows open, and have the same experience. They don't look appropriate for our community.

I think I'd like to see, as this develops ... and part of my questioning about the solar panels is, my reaction was very negative to that as a façade material. And I don't believe they're a wrong thing to have. You know, you're showing a lot of solar panels on the roof as other

places. They're temporary, they're on stands. You know, I don't really understand why they're there and I don't feel we need to make a statement any more in this town, that solar panels are a good thing to have on your building because that, to me, was like that's kind of cool, they're, you know, promoting solar panels. But they look ugly as a façade material and I don't think they're that permanent and et cetera, et cetera.

I also am not a big fan of the mansard roof and these sort of piers with the corbelling that's starting to mimic the cornice of the buildings. I just think that all needs to be thought about proportionately, as well. And I'd love to know more about sustainable EIFS because I lived in Atlanta for a long time where EIFS was king.

Female Voice: That's (off-mic).

Boardmember Sullivan: I know. I'd like to know very much more about it because, for me, it's an interesting material. I'd like to find out why, but it's basically foam insulation with cement parging on it. So why this is a sustainable material would be interesting. You put it down but, again, materials will be something we'll want to look into at some point.

But I think this needs to go a little bit further to fit better into the downtown. You have a beautiful example on the corner: there's some rhythms, there's some proportions, things to pick up:: there's window patterns, four windows ganged together. I don't know where else we see that in the community. Let's look and try to ... I'm not a contextualist (*sic*) person, but it should feel like it belongs there. I don't mind it being from this time, but I just think there's things this needs to be developed to fit better.

Otherwise I think it's a very interesting project and I'm excited for you. I am concerned about neighbors. I don't know where that is in seeking the things about lot line buildings.

Ms. Idelson: (Off-mic).

Mr. Weinstein: The lot line.

Boardmember Sullivan: The lot line, that's a conversation. I don't know what you have to say about it, but it's a concern because I walked there this morning and saw how many windows were going to be taken away. And that building – it's a two-story building that's attached to a four-story building – there's probably not many windows on the other side. So anyways, I'd like to see the elevation brought ... we need more information about it, we need to understand the roof, where the solar panels are. You have an awful lot of potential for it in a place that's not visible to the street. So maybe you can give up the under 600 square feet of them because you have places for 50 or a thousand square feet elsewhere that's not in the street, in that part of the street façade.

Boardmember Gould-Schmit: I won't repeat it, but I feel like Kathy read my mind. I mean, everything from the solar panels as a façade treatment it just does not strike me as appropriate. I mean, I am not a fan of EIFS. I don't think it fits in with the town. I think, to be quite frank, it's an inexpensive treatment that will save you money, but it does not have wherewithal. It's just not ... I just think that should be rethought.

And a Juliette balcony out on this frame, I see no value in that as well. I was definitely – like I am ... I think it's an interesting project. I'd love to have something along the street wall. So those things, you know, the heavy lifts I actually am on board with. But I definitely feel like the façade needs work.

Chairman O'Reilly: Since Richard Bass was mentioned, I just wanted to make ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Please do. I did use his name in vain.

Chairman O'Reilly: Not in vain at all, but I just wanted to add in what he had sent prior to the meeting, since he could not be here. But he did want to make an opinion known. He says he's always in favor of infill in a hole in the downtown's urban fabric. He said he's wondered about the balcony seating that can't be accessed and the blank wall that deadens the pedestrian experience. Question about the proposed garage circulation we've already mentioned, internally and when exiting the proposed building. But additionally, he would like to see more detail on the rear façade treatment which will be obvious to so many people when they come in and out of the Chase parking lot.

And I have no other additional comments to what has been said already. Did we have any other comments?

Boardmember Alligood: I'm going to just say "ditto," and "ditto" again.

Chairman O'Reilly: Ditto again, yes, good. And we have people from the public to speak on this. We did get one submission, maybe that woman is here this evening.

Boardmember Sullivan: Elizabeth Perry.

Village Attorney Whitehead: No.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think she said had a conflict and couldn't come.

Chairman O'Reilly: Oh, okay. Maybe you could mention that?

Boardmember Sullivan: I'll look for it right now for you.

Chairman O'Reilly: In the meantime, if you wish to speak on the project which we heard about you may come forward. Please identify yourself; introduce your name and your address, and your interest.

This is the one microphone that's working?

Chairman O'Reilly: That's the live one.

Suzannah Kane, 7 Spring Street: I'm owner of the neighboring building to the proposed plan that you've been referencing. As you've discussed, the property – my building – is two stories with one commercial space below that houses the Food For Thought health food store and one apartment above, which has been my personal family residence for 18 years. I'm not an investor. This isn't an investment property for me, it's been my home where I've raised my family.

Food For Thought is a locally-owned health food store run by Dwight Burke, he wasn't able to be here. But it's been in his family for 32 years. I just want to say I, too, fully support reasonable and appropriate development in the center commercial district. That's why I live in town. I love to walk around, I want it to be dynamic and thriving, but I have many concerns about the plans as I have seen them in the writeups.

So some of the issues that I have a concern with are the scale of the building. In my opinion, it's too large, taking the bulk of the 0.14-acre lot. It's not in scale to the buildings on our side of the street in terms of from my building, on west to Maple Avenue. While they're three stories, they're much more petite in kind of feel. The plan describes this new construction as being three stories, but it's shown to sort of almost function as four with those raised panels, with the mezzanine space, and with no consideration whatsoever for setback, as is indicated in the Village design plan.

You know, I understand ... in the presentation, it was described somehow as like an average height of the building as opposed to a standard height, which gives them leeway and play to make it higher in spots. Not only is the building too high and there's no setback, but the width of the building is extremely wide relative to the others on the street on that side as you look at it.

While the proposal suggests that the new building is in scale with the former Hastings House on the corner, the bulk of that building faces east on Warburton Avenue. The remaining buildings on Spring from west to Maple Avenue are much smaller, as is the current building that resides there as the funeral home. They're narrow in width and with a historical and residential feel. My building is one of the oldest buildings in town, built in the late 1800s. And it, along with my western neighbors, sets the character and village feel of the block.

When you turn east or west onto Spring Street you see our cluster of small, charming buildings; not the Hastings House. That's what in your line of view. You look up and you see from the corner to my space, and now the empty lot and the parking it's very charming. This is a much, much larger density and scale and width.

Another concern that I have is accessibility. The current drawings provide no setback, as they have mentioned, to our shared property line where the parking lot currently sits. And the plan extends back ... did I do that? And the plans extend back to the very edge of the Chase parking lot. That's my entire property line. This would prevent my egress to the side and back portion of my house, which includes the porch and the backyard. How will I be able to gain access to it for maintenance and repairs, for things like siding, windows, the porch, my yard? This lack of setback will prohibit me from major upkeep of my home.

There are many examples of generous setbacks being toward buildings that currently exist downtown: across the street, west of 6 Spring, next to the diner, alongside Sterling National Bank. There should be a generous setback on our border in this plan. Also, natural light and airflow. As currently drawn, with its oversized height and no setback, the new building would completely block all five of my apartment's eastern-facing windows, as well as the three eastern well windows in my tenant's door. This is an issue that was raised.

These windows are not something that I added to the building, they existed. As I said, I've had it for 18 years. They predate me, and they were grandfathered into my plan. They are my main source of daylight. You mentioned are there any windows on the other side. Virtually none. There's two tiny windows on that side, and due to the close proximity of my neighbors no daylight comes in from that direction, of the west. This would effectively cut off the natural light on both levels, restrict airflow, and radically diminish our quality of life.

The other concern I have is for drainage. They mentioned that no civil engineer has been brought in at this point to kind of examine these issues, but I already experience drainage problems from the parking lot next door and get water in my basement from storm runoff. With the extreme proximity and high roofline of the proposed building, these problems will only worsen.

Air quality and safety. During the demolition phase of this project, how will any dust, debris and/or contaminants be mitigated so they do not affect my property or that of my tenant, a health food store? That's where our windows are located, that's where my porch and yard face. How will my residents and my tenant store be protected?

Quality of life. The back portion of the plan would effectively seal up my back porch, which is currently open to the east and is one of the biggest assets on the property. It would destroy the view and reduce airflow. This area would also eliminate any privacy to our backyard, which sits on a lower grade due to that sloping. You don't have a photo of it, but I can

provide one if you need. The new building and its patio would loom over our yard. Both circumstances would drastically impact our quality of life and property value, something which is highlighted and protected in section 3.4 of the design guidelines.

On a personal note, I love living downtown. I chose to raise my daughter here and be part of a long-standing community of local and long-term residents. It's the lifeblood of the Village. Some people have questioned my choice, thinking that living in this district must be noisy or inconvenient, but I love it. From my kitchen window and back porch I can look east and enjoy the vibrancy of town, see people strolling through the parking lot to the Farmers' Market, walking their dogs or, most often, running to the train. To me, living here is the epitome of being in a pedestrian-friendly community, and we must make every effort to protect it.

Thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you. Do we have others?

Frank Sinatra, Jr., applicant: Good late evening everyone, and thank you for allowing to hear our case here tonight. As Ed said, I own the funeral home here – I've owned several other funeral homes – and it seems just a short time ago that I purchased it. It was in the year 1985. For so many years my family and I have tried to help families in their time of need and, hopefully, we've been successful doing that.

However some time ago, I guess you can say – like my namesake sang so eloquently – "and now the end is near." Funeral homes have changed in the way they're run, they've changed in the way they look, they've changed in the way they're managed. And you can look at the funeral home I just finished building in Yonkers, which is all handicapped-accessible, has more than 90 parking spaces, and serves families in their time of need so much better than the funeral home we have here in Hastings.

My family and I are very proud of what we've done the last 34 years. And, as I said, I examined my potential choices here and thought to myself that this is a wonderful asset: having real estate that you own, that you've owned for so long, don't owe any money on. I had to look at what I had to do to make this a viable asset. And as I spoke to Ed over the last few months, I've determined that the way to go is to do exactly what intend to do. And that is, put classy retail and hopefully very accommodative apartments so people can live and enjoy the Village of Hastings like I have enjoyed the last 34 years. And if I don't do it, certainly some other developer will do it.

In order to make this piece of real estate viable, something like this has to be done, in my opinion. I'm a businessman, I understand the concerns of my neighbor. And quite frankly, using my parking lot as a pedestrian walkway, as a shortcut, doesn't make this particular

building less of a ... you know, why keep the building here so people can walk through the lot from the bank to go to Spring Street and make a shortcut? My insurance company has said to me many times you cannot allow people to do that.

So we've come to the end and, hopefully, things will work out properly and the Village of Hastings will be better for it. Thank you very much.

Marie Ross, 24 Maple Avenue: I just wanted to also speak to this project. You know, actually I wanted to just make you aware that I'm within the radius for public notice but did not receive notice until just a few days before this meeting so I really haven't had a chance to fully take a look at things. And I'm aware of other neighbors that did not receive notice of any kind so just be aware that there may have been more persons that would've been here tonight to speak on this matter.

But I wanted to speak on this because when I did receive notice and I looked up the project I was, frankly, shocked by the size and scope of the project. You know, I understand Mr. Sinatra's point that the town has a viable interest in promoting economic development. And certainly, as the property owner, he's interested in having something developed there that's going to be profitable for him. But I think what I would ask of the board is that you take into consideration what is the nature of the project that's being proposed.

It is out of character with the size and scope of the other properties on the street. It is much taller – Ms. Kane made the point – than the western properties that go down the street. The look of the building is very different than anything else in town. You know, Hastings ... we moved to Hastings 15 years ago because we wanted to live in a small town that had a small town feel, that was accessible to the city. It's a very walkable community. We want a valuable downtown. You know, I question what's the effect on the Hastings House, which is a historic structure that we would really like to see developed and something brought in there that's viable.

The current project that's been proposed is supposed to have a rooftop function aspect, is my understanding. You know, many of the things that have been considered going in to that Hastings House have been function, things that would hold larger functions, that might use something like a rooftop. And how would this size structure impact somebody looking to do that? As the point was made, there is retail structure that's being added to this and residential structure, but we do have to consider the size and the dimensions because we don't even fill the retail structures that are downtown right now.

So, you know, Mr. Sinatra has an interest in developing something, but let's keep it in the character of the nature of what is already there. So I don't know what limitations or how you can affect the scope of this project, but you really need to look at what can be done.

My other concern, as somebody that lives in Maple, Spring Street is a small street but a main corridor to the train. Commuters are ... you know, it's a very active corridor for egress, for the police, for residents in the neighborhood. And the driveway that's there now is very infrequently used, and we're asking to put in six residents with a very shallow entrance point. And it's going to tie up Spring Street. It's going to tie up Spring Street for the retail spaces, for supply, for parking. And it is going to affect the traffic patterns.

What's going to happen? People are going to come down North and fly down Maple Avenue, which is a residentially-lined street with many young families and two school buses. For a parent that has raised three children, that has stood at bus stops – and have people who are going to the train cut to the inside of the bus, whilst children are standing waiting for the bus, to get to the train – I don't want to see that happening again.

As is always a concern – as somebody that lives downtown – parking is going to be impacted, too. I know that it's being mitigated because there's 10 spots, but it will certainly displace current parking. So that is something that at least should be thought about in a considerate (*sic*) way. What I ask you to do is consider what is the benefit of the size and scope of this project and what are the detriments. I mean, it is extremely detrimental to its western neighbor. This shows complete lack of consideration for 7 Spring Street.

I know Mr. Sinatra says it is his property, but as it is now it is an open lot that is frequently utilized as a pass-through for pedestrian traffic, for people walking to the train, for people going to the shops, for people going to the Farmers' Market. Would he be open to maintaining that communal spirit and providing for something that would help and maintain pedestrian flow and circulation? That is something we are always looking at. He has choices, too, of being a good neighbor. And he can make those choices. That's something that I'm hoping will be integrated into the project.

Thank you.

Kelly Topilnycky, 18 Maple Avenue: I echo some of the things that you guys brought up. My husband had to leave for work so he couldn't be here, but his concern is the building really doesn't fit in with the character of Spring Street. The solar panels were one of his things. He kind of said that they were ugly. He understands the solar panels. I mean, our neighbors have solar panels on their houses, but they're not visible. There's a big difference about coming around that corner and those things are smack in your face.

I had concerns because some of the renderings, you didn't provide really what it looks like from behind. Now, Maple Avenue runs this way so we see the building from behind. Our concern is if you have a retail space – and you're talking about a coffee shop or somebody opens a restaurant and decides that back patio is a wonderful place to have tables – well, now you're impacting all the neighbors on Maple Avenue because of noise. We have a coffee

shop, but they have a big cement wall that's like 10, 15 feet so it muffles the noise. That's a concern for the residents that live on Maple Avenue.

I do have concerns about the parking also. Obviously, you're providing 10 parking spaces. I guess there's six apartments in it, I don't know how many parking spaces per unit would have to be provided for. But assuming you're not providing any parking for the retail spaces, again, you have employees and owners of retail spaces. Where are they going to park? They're going to come park on Maple Avenue like everybody else does. That's a problem for the residents that live here.

That whole corner, you can't put parking there. It is a loading zone. You said that it's not a loading zone. We have tractor trailers. Food For Thought, they get tractor trailer deliveries so don't tell me that little trucks come. There's tractor trailers always on Spring Street delivering to the different businesses. When you come around that corner from Warburton onto Spring, if there's a truck there you have to swerve out into the other side. If it's during a commuting time it's an issue. Again, I don't know what kind of retail it would be so I don't know what kind of deliveries they would get, but other businesses on that street do get tractor trailers.

I have another concern about the waste disposal. With 555, they're putting a dumpster in the Chase. It's going to be along the building in the Chase parking lot. You guys in put a patio, you talked about losing a parking space for a dumpster for inside the building. I mean, why don't you think about doing a dumpster on the outside, in back? Maybe that would settle some of the issues, too. I'm not saying put a dumpster against Suzannah's deck, but you could certainly put it towards 555 and it would be well away from her. It looks like you're coming in quite a number of feet because of the offsets – that was just a suggestion – rather than have to worry about dumpsters. We have the dumpster from Chase and we're always telling them – and they're a bank so they're not supposed to have like foodstuff in there – in the summer, people dump stuff in there and it smells. So I certainly would not wish to create an issue with a dumpster, but it's a suggestion.

Also, concern because you said that you're not doing anything with the roof right now, you're making it a greenspace. But there could be a future where they decide that they want the tenants to be able to access the roof, like a deck or something. I don't know if that changes plans. And the Juliette balconies are strange. Not for nothing, all they're going to be looking at is that cow on the next building. But the Juliette balconies, I mean I don't know why you didn't just offset the front and just put real balconies to take advantage of the view of the river instead of putting terraces and decks or whatever you're going to do on the back of the building. Which I'm not sure because you didn't include renderings of that, just sort of from the side view. But rather than having them overlooking our backyards – which, again, is a privacy issue for the homes on Maple Avenue – to put something on the front of the building where they can actually have a river view. So a suggestion.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Topilnycky: Mr. Sinatra, we've used your funeral home, and yes, we would like to see the property developed. That is kind of like a big thing. (Off-mic) that you can't put a foot alleyway. Take it from me, I live on Maple Avenue and one side of our house is a couple of feet of alleyway; there's no light, there's no air, and that is what it would be like on Suzannah's line. So it's a consideration. Maybe they can slide the building over a little bit – make more of an alleyway – and she doesn't lose stuff.

So thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you for your comments. Do we have another?

Michael Ross, 24 Maple Avenue: I'll keep this brief because I agree with most of what was said earlier. I just also want to voice my concern of just the size and scope of this project and how it's out of character with the surrounding buildings. The aesthetics, I know, can be fixed with redesign. But I also really worry about the effect on the neighbor. Living downtown, I worry if the board does not protect neighbors from being hurt like this. I mean, I would call it an aggressively hostile plan to Ms. Kane in 7 Spring Street: make it so you cannot even maintain the siding in your house and see out your windows that you've been looking out for – I think she said – 18 years.

So I just encourage you to really try to, you know, protect everybody involved here. I understand the need to maximize a profit on your asset, but there needs to be people protected in the process. Thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay.

Irene Maher, 22 Maple Avenue: Good evening. I'd just like to add my voice to those of my neighbors about the size and the scope, and the direct impact on Ms. Kane's quality of life. And to really emphasize, you have six apartments, or six people. They probably have multiple cars. Parking and safety on Maple Avenue is a very big issue. We are very lucky there's been no fatalities.

And that's all I wanted to say, to make sure my voice was added. Thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you. Okay, I think we have no other comment. We do all take these things ... it's always a difficult issue when you have an infill development in a zone that is clearly compliant. But nonetheless, the issues you raise are ... we had that one letter that you want to ...

Boardmember Sullivan: I brought it up here, yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, let me just include this from Ms. Perry, Liz Perry. It says "Hastings resident," does not give her address. But I would like to ... no, she doesn't say where she lives. Anybody know Ms. Perry?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I believe she lives on High Street.

"Submit: input as a Hastings resident on the proposal," yada, yada, yada.

"Residents and planners can agree that open space is preferable to closed space for various reasons. The proposal would require demolishing an existing, apparently usable, building and converting valuable open space into closed space. The change impacts the livability of the downtown, covering up valuable views, contributing to congestion in small towns downtown.

I'm just going to pick items here:

"I think this design overly incentivizes the property's neighbors to potentially grow, upward as well as outward. I would advocate a proposal, if any, that better utilizes the existing structures and preserves/creates open space rather than replacing open space. And an existing two-story building with a three-story building that consumes the entire lot.

"I would appreciate if his letter were read at the planning board meeting. I will not be able to attend in person. And at a minimum, I request that it be read to all members of the planning board and those helping to make this decision."

*Elizabeth Perry
Hastings resident*

I hope she's happy with the fact that I've selected certain areas, but the letter will go into the record. I didn't miss anything important.

Male Voice: Thank you.

Boardmember Sullivan: You're welcome.

Chairman O'Reilly: So I think we've given it a fair airing, and I think you have sufficient guidance and heard from those community members. And you've heard from us with the suggestions. I think that is, therefore, the way we'll leave it this evening. There's nothing

further that we can do except to present this. And you have the issues, which will go, obviously, to those in the public, You have to know that it also has to go to the zoning board, but it is zoning compliant at this point.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It only goes to the zoning board for view preservation so it doesn't go yet.

Chairman O'Reilly: No, but it will eventually.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Eventually, just for view preservation.

Chairman O'Reilly: And it has to go to the architectural review board. But the issues we have to look at is the SEQRA application and those areas that have been raised for discussion. And also, it will not go to the zoning board at this point until we have gone through view preservation and ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Completed SEQRA.

Chairman O'Reilly: ... SEQRA.

Boardmember Alligood: Can I just make ... I'd like to make one comment. I think, you know, we'll often get a proposal where the statement by the applicant is this is the only option. I do want to acknowledge this is as-of-right, but I do want to say there are always options. And in fact, I've been disappointed for a long time that the option of developing this property along with Hastings House was not reviewed and pursued and considered and researched. Absolutely, 100 percent, that project would have been better, this project would have been better.

So I want to put that on the record because I've said that before, it's been in the discourse. It's unfortunate that were at this place where that building went forward with its plan and this is now coming and it's disconnected from what would have been a really, really tremendous opportunity. So I want to put that on the record. It's just a lost opportunity

Chairman O'Reilly: Thanks.

Mr. Weinstein: Thank you for your time and thoughtful comments.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

On MOTION of Boardmember Sullivan, SECONDED by Boardmember Gould-Schmit, Chairman O'Reilly adjourned the Regular Meeting.

