

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 15, 2019**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, August 15, 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 Richard Bass, Alternate Boardmember Richard Martin, Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr., and Planning Consultant Patrick Cleary

Chairman O'Reilly: Good evening. Apologize for our technical difficulties, and others, but here we are. Welcome, this is the meeting of the Planning Board of Hastings-on-Hudson, Thursday, August 15, 2019. Can we have a roll call, please?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Sure.

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Regular Meeting of June 20, 2019
Regular Meeting of July 18, 2019**

Chairman O'Reilly: The next item on the agenda would be the approval of minutes, but we don't have a quorum of those who were present for the meetings of either June 20 or July 18.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: For either? So adjourn them both?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: So we'll pass them on until the next meeting.

III. OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman O'Reilly: We have one old public hearing, just in case anyone's here for the others; the public hearing related to 10 West Main Street, related to 15 Spring Street Realty, and related to 280 Warburton Avenue, that being deferred to future meetings. The one which

we will be discussing tonight is the view preservation advisory and site plan approval application of River Road LLC.

1. Vision Plan 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 M-W Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-19-4 on the Village Tax Maps.

Chairman O'Reilly: You are to present on this project? Please introduce yourself, name and affiliation to the project.

Bruce Bernacchia, applicant: I'm the owner and principal of Harvest on Hudson and River Road LLC. We were here a month ago and discussed, on a very preliminary basis, some ideas for a greenhouse for the garden to integrate that with the rest of the restaurant. If I can figure out how to work this I'll start at the beginning.

Basically, we're going to add an 18- by 40-foot greenhouse to the southern edge of the garden, integrate that within the garden environment. We have an existing service bar that we'd relocate into the greenhouse, and get that out of the rain. We will replace about a dozen dining seats with about eight to ten bar seats inside the service bar.

We developed a couple of renderings to give everybody a little bit better idea other than the black and white plans that we were working with last time. You're looking at the garden as it exists, with the greenhouse structure towards the top right. These are differences from the last plan, but this gives you a little bit better impression about how that would be integrated into the garden; kind of incorporate the garden within the greenhouse, as well. We'll be growing everything, as we do for everything else in the restaurant.

In terms of site plan, there's an existing trellis on the left, the circular garden in the center, and to the top of the screen is basically an 18- by 40-foot greenhouse. We'll be using a bunch of tiered growing tables, max out as much of the growing space as we can for as much of the year as we can. And I think it'll be a nice adjunct to the rest of the gardening that's going on at the restaurant. Again, a couple more shots of what this would be looking like within the garden. Slow me down if I'm going too fast.

This is looking with your back against the river towards the garden. Basically, we're doing this to further the farm-to-table atmosphere of the restaurant. We grow a lot of stuff right now; we want to do that, continue that, for literally four seasons. It was a farm-to-table thing before that was a term. I've been doing this for 20 years, kind of proud of the heritage.

We're going to be recycling the water off the gutters. We're using organic gardening practices; everything that gets grown there is basically organic. We're utilizing some waste for composting and integrating that into the whole system. On a number of occasions, any number of occasions, we have kids down from the grade school of Hastings, teach them how to plant and make pizza. There's a big cleanup after that. But we've gotten a lot of mileage out of the garden with local schools and a variety of groups.

There was a couple of concerns last time we spoke I think, primarily the view for the parking lot. We had a stacked stone wall, anticipating comments about lighting, and just in general how this thing would be managed. So we moved the building a little bit, created additional buffer. There was a concern about the length of the wall. We added more glass, cut sort of the 40-foot low wall in half to about 20 feet with glass above. Then you can see the right and left side of the building. We took the glass all the way down to about 18 inches, kind of right above the foundation.

In addition, we'd be planting in front of that where the arborvitaes are. The picture shows low-growth there, but these'll grow up. Mostly what you're going to see is a greenhouse, not necessarily a wall. But again, trying to get some idea or concept of what this would look like from the parking lot side.

Chairman O'Reilly: Can I ask you what it is that's at the eastern end of the greenhouse?

Mr. Bernacchia: So that we had spoken about a little bit. Right now where that black chimney is, that's a ... let me see if I can find the right one. Well, that's part of the trellis right now, with an existing fireplace and the service bar. So the idea would be to remove the service bar and rebuild that fireplace, which is breaking up a little bit, and cover that with the same tile that we have on the building and on the other part of the trellis there. So that would be a rebuilt fireplace basically right where the existing one is.

Exterior stone is going to be a stacked stone type thing; it's a veneer stone, natural stone, but it looks pretty nice. Lights are full cutoff fixtures. We're integrating, as we spoke last time ... the greenhouse needs shades inside so they'll be automatic shades on the roof. In the summer you need it for shade to keep the place from getting overheated; in the winter, you would retain a little bit more heat with this thing. And the automatic shades will diffuse any light that's being generated in there. There's some sconces on the exterior, but the interior will be all full cutoff fixtures.

Basically we're just trying to maximize the garden, integrate that into the existing restaurant use, provide a unique environment for the guests, and utilize the product. There's some other data here, but that's the overall site plan for the whole concept. Any questions, we'd be happy to see if I can answer them.

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, I think it's a far better structure than it was on the last meeting.

Mr. Bernacchia: It needed a little bit more rendering and color to the whole thing to bring it to life.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes. And the materials you indicated would be consistent with the other buildings that you have already. I mean, consistent with how the (cross-talk) ...

Mr. Bernacchia: Yes. We did show a little bit of the stacked stone, this stacked stone around the garden right now. All the beds are all stacked stone. And the wood that would be integrated into this is going to natural wood, cedar. Then we have predominantly glass.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay. Richard, you have questions?

Boardmember Bass: Sure, just a general comment. None of the numbers in the site plans on the pages agree with each other. That site plan has your building 38 feet, point 33 wide; on other places you have it at 40, some places you had 41.4.

Mr. Bernacchia: On the most recent set of plans?

Boardmember Bass: Yes, yes. So I don't know what the site plan really is because your numbers are all over the place. Also it's not scaled, and numbers are not provided. I was pulling out my architects scale and had to measure out the plans. That shouldn't be what I or the other members of the board should be doing.

Mr. Bernacchia: Sure, sure.

Boardmember Bass: So your architect should be providing that information.

My concerns are a number. Why is the building 17-1/2 feet tall? Why is a greenhouse required to have that height?

Mr. Bernacchia: Well, it's not required. I think it's aesthetically appropriate. It's not out of scale with the property. So it's an aesthetic decision.

Boardmember Bass: So programmatically, it could be ... can you go back to your earlier slides? You can use that one.

Mr. Bernacchia: I'm trying to get to that one.

Boardmember Bass: No, that's not a good one. Keep going, keep going. Actually, go back to the one you just passed. So that one – that "hat," that roof – could be flat. There's no

reason why ...

Mr. Bernacchia: No, a greenhouse is really ... it would be inappropriate to be flat. It needs to be vented, it needs to have a ... the roof, the peak line is all vented.

Boardmember Bass: Right, but I've never seen a greenhouse that's peaked 6-1/2 feet. I find that unnecessary and adds to the bulk of the building because the building still is 41 feet wide. You've changed materials, but you still ... my concern was, it's quite a barrier between, you know, the parking lot and your establishment. So by reducing that height to the cornice and having a lower-pitch roof, that might be more appropriate. If you want, provide information on the roofs of greenhouses. I've never seen a greenhouse that's 17-1/2 feet tall.

Mr. Bernacchia: Yeah. I mean, I think it's fairly common, but if you haven't seen it I understand that. But they're common and they're seen all over the place in terms of ... I can give you any number of different ...

Boardmember Bass: Give me five examples, you know.

Mr. Bernacchia: Sure, okay.

Boardmember Bass: The planting strip between the parking lot and the building's now 2 feet.

Mr. Bernacchia: Yeah.

Boardmember Bass: Nothing grows in 2 feet.

Mr. Bernacchia: The plants we have there now are about 2 foot.

Boardmember Bass: No, the planting on the plan is 7 feet – 7 or 8 feet – which also would have been helpful.

Mr. Bernacchia: That's the garden going out ...

Boardmember Bass: Go back to the original, go to the site plan. Again, if this were scale this is 7 or 8 feet wide.

Mr. Bernacchia: Right.

Boardmember Bass: That's a decent width of planting, or even 5 feet. But 2 feet is less than the width of this desk.

Mr. Bernacchia: You know, the arborvitaes we have now are about 2 feet wide where they exist. I understand that you'd like to see more. We're working with a confinement, trying to work with the site. The effect of the plantings there are going to be enough to disguise what is otherwise a very nice-looking stacked stone wall anyhow, and a beautiful greenhouse. So there's enough planting there to adequately present a nice green face from the parking lot side.

Boardmember Bass: But none of that information is provided in the site plan.

Mr. Bernacchia: Well, let me provide it.

Boardmember Bass: Again, the onus is on you on what kind of plants are going to survive in a 2-foot wide strip. The curb definition in the parking lot is wider than 2 feet, and you can see what grows there. So I'm suspect that 2 feet is going to be adequate in terms of a greenspace between our public space and your private space.

Mr. Bernacchia: Yeah. Well, I mean, first of all the public space you're referring to is our parking lot so there isn't anything between this and the public space.

Boardmember Bass: I understand that but, again, you're in a discretionary review. You're asking for permission for things beyond what you can do as-of-right. So I don't know how my other boardmembers feel, but a 2-foot green strip is insufficient; a 17-1/2 foot tall building is insufficient. The site plan shows seven seats, but you talk about eight to ten seats. I, again, scaled out the planting beds. The planting beds in my backyard are larger than what you have here.

Mr. Bernacchia: Again, the planting beds we will be filling in that specifically on the interior. They're also tiered; they're all three-tiered planting beds.

Boardmember Bass: But again, you're giving a site plan for a public body to review ...

Mr. Bernacchia: Yes.

Boardmember Bass: This is inadequate. You're trying to sell a story, to tell a story. And I'm not opposed to, you know, you having this type of structure. But I do have serious concerns about the height of the building, the setback from the parking lot, and the inconsistencies in the site plan. It would be really useful to have more information about greenhouses. You have a 750 square foot greenhouse proposed. How does that compare to other greenhouses, other farm-to-table places?

Mr. Bernacchia: Well, I don't think there's anybody that has anything like this in terms of a farm-to-table restaurant. In terms of greenhouses and conservatories, it doesn't ... you know, they're very popular. There's any number of Web sites that have these things as part of

residential structures or commercial structures.

Boardmember Bass: Then provide that information.

Mr. Bernacchia: Okay, that's fine. That's an easy ...

Boardmember Bass: Again, when you were here two months ago, because that presentation was incomplete it seemed more like an excuse to have more seating than a greenhouse. This goes further in telling that story, but tell us that story. You know, why do you need a 17-1/2 foot tall greenhouse? What you verbally say and what you have on the plans are very different things. And the plans have to be consistent and they have to be more thorough.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, thanks, Richard.

Dick, did you have any comments?

Boardmember Martin: No comment.

Chairman O'Reilly: Kathleen?

Boardmember Sullivan: Richard has articulated many of concerns I had. I appreciate his attention to the planting strip. I'd ask to take a look at the previous site plan to understand what that strip was intended for. I assume it was for screening from the parking lot, which is not just a parking lot for your use but also a way people get to the park on the waterfront. That was the consideration that some other boardmembers who aren't here tonight were concerned about. That by having a structure instead of what we walk by now, which is sort of a wall of green, that it was a concern.

I think you've done some things to improve it. I do believe it's quite out of scale still for the location it's in. I think some of the 3-dimensional drawings show that. The height, what Richard pointed out, was something I'm very concerned about. Again, you've brought it down but it's still, I think, too prominent for the parking lot side.

Getting some examples of other types of structures to sort of show the dimensions is appropriate. I'm not a real fan of the seating, which wasn't shown last time – if I'm not mistaken – being shown this time. If I'm not mistaken, last time ...

Mr. Bernacchia: We did suggest it last time. I don't know how much detail we did on an interior.

Boardmember Sullivan: But it wasn't shown as a seating area. I think that came up; I think Patrick had it in his review, and it wasn't necessarily ... so this is starting to become more of a seating area, which I'm not sure quite how that falls into the zoning for this property. I

think you're allowed to do what's called "accessory uses." We haven't really discussed this, and I'm not too sure what the list of those is. But when I see a woodstove in the greenhouse it makes me think it's becoming something different than a greenhouse; that it's an additional restaurant area.

I'm very supportive of the greenhouse. I'm familiar with them, in some ways, from having worked in places with them. So I understand the environment for growing and appreciate what you said about venting and sort of the shading you need. That's all very much online with what I'm familiar with, but this is starting to become something different than a greenhouse, from my take. I just want to ask a question, I guess, for Linda and Patrick: you know, what are the uses that would be appropriate for a secondary structure like this at this site?

We may need some research. I would love to see the site plan that was from, I think, 1998. I went searching on our Web site and can't find it. But it'd be very helpful because people, and you, spent a lot of time on that back in the day. I'd sort of like to respect it and, you know, build from it; understand sort of what the thoughts were then, and then change it if need be. But from what I see, the intention was to screen the patio from people that are in the parking lot. And I'm not seeing this anymore, in particular to what Richard mentioned: the very minimal planting strip.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Kathy, we can take a look at the accessory uses. But in terms of the uses that are going here, they are uses that are already there. The service bar already exists, they're just moving it.

Boardmember Sullivan: Okay.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And the seating they're actually reducing because there's seating in that area today.

Boardmember Sullivan: Okay.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So I understand your question relates more to those things now going into a building, but they're not adding new uses. And in terms of the screening from the parking lot, I think if you go back historically – remember, this was something new and different – it might have been an even greater concern then than it is now. So you can look at that fresh, and if you still want the same level of screening that's fine. But you're not bound by your prior approval. You can look at it fresh and say, okay, now 20 years later ...

Mr. Bernacchia: If I can tell you, there was no screening requirement when we built this.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So the arborvitae, you put there?

Mr. Bernacchia: We put there.

Boardmember Sullivan: I guess since it wasn't an existing site plan I'd just like to see it, just to know. Then, like you say, we can change it if ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think, you know, the comment that they chose to put the arborvitae there is probably more that they wanted to screen the view from the garden to the parking lot.

Mr. Bernacchia: We wanted to screen the parking lot rather than ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Rather than the parking lot being screened from them.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right. We'll find out and it would be nice to see it, but I'm concerned about the height as well.

Mr. Bernacchia: It does match the rest of the trellis.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, it's 17-1/2 feet tall to the ridge.

Village Attorney Whitehead: To the peak.

Boardmember Sullivan: Then the peak is 11-1/2, if I read the drawings right, to the existing or to that other little structure you're making. So it's a little bit higher.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That trellis roof is existing, isn't it?

Mr. Bernacchia: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, that's existing.

Boardmember Bass: Great. But the height and the scale is really the issue. It's not, you know, Ooh, look, we have something else that's almost as tall. Because the trellis isn't as tall, but you're creating a 41-foot wide structure that's now 17-1/2 feet wide. That massing is the concern. You know, if we're talking about something that's only ... you know, if you wanted to pivot your building or move your building further on your property that's a different issue. But right now you have a 41-1/2 foot wide structure that's 17-1/2 feet tall. That's significant, that's not comparable to anything else on your property.

Boardmember Sullivan: As these sort of garden-like structures that are out in the garden, yes.

Boardmember Bass: And the 3-dimensional pictures. I do site plan for a living. I find this drawing, or these drawings, disingenuous because they really don't show the height. The building really is tall.

Mr. Bernacchia: Well, I think they show it fairly accurate, especially in comparison to the trellis and everything else. So, I mean, I wouldn't call it disingenuous at all. We put a lot of effort into this ...

Boardmember Bass: I understand that, but ...

Mr. Bernacchia: ... and to say it's disingenuous is unfair.

Boardmember Bass: I hear you, but I ...

Mr. Bernacchia: So I think this is a very good depiction of what's there. I understand the concerns. We'll address them. I think it fits in very nicely to the garden. I don't think it's an exorbitant building at all. The Spanish style roof is as tall as this, the building itself is twice as tall, and it does sit in the middle of our parking lot. You know, we keep saying it's public access and everything else, but this is the middle of our parking lot.

Boardmember Bass: Right, but you're asking for a discretionary review ...

Mr. Bernacchia: I understand that, I understand that.

Boardmember Bass: ... so all bets are off. When you're asking for approval for something out of the norm, all bets are off.

Mr. Bernacchia: I understand. I'm arguing the point that it's not terribly out of scale with this thing.

Boardmember Bass: And you're hearing the board's disagreeing with you.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just to clarify, the whole board has not said that.

Chairman O'Reilly: At this point, no. That's true.

Boardmember Sullivan: Can I just ask a question, because I'm confused. When I look at the plan, A-1 has an east elevation. You have the top of the ridge being at 25.5 and the peak of the next one being at 16. So I'm confused on exactly ...

Mr. Bernacchia: I'm sorry, I'm not ...

Boardmember Sullivan: If you look at sheet A-1.

Mr. Bernacchia: A-1.

Boardmember Sullivan: Help me out. When I look at these, in the first drawing – the east elevation – it has ridge elevation at 25.5 and a first floor elevation of 8, okay? So that's your 17.6. Over here, next, it has the peak at 16. That, to me, is like a 9-foot difference. I'm very thrown by that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: This isn't the greenhouse. That's the cupola.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right. But I'm just trying to say if you're putting in elevations like that you're talking about them in relationship to each other. I'm just very confused on where exactly the ridge is in relationship to this new canopy that's being put over the terrace.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The canopy is existing. Oh, to match the existing.

Boardmember Sullivan: New canopy over existing fireplace. I'm confused on what height this thing is.

Mr. Bernacchia: Well, you got two different heights.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Two different buildings.

Mr. Bernacchia: The building all the way to your right, and the trellis and fireplace on the left side.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right. What I'm saying is these are absolutes, they're not relative to the site. They're absolutes based on survey points. So it's showing that the ridge of the new structure – is that 25.5 feet? – and the next one over, the new canopy over the fireplace, says the peak's at 16. The difference in that is ...

Mr. Bernacchia: No, no, no. It's not 25 feet; it's 17.6.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The new building is 17.6, the canopy is 16.

Boardmember Sullivan: The difference between the ridge elevation at 25.5 and the peak of this new canopy over the fireplace; that's at 16? So the difference is greater than ...

Mr. Bernacchia: The entire building height for the greenhouse is 17.6 from ground level. Are you measuring from ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think there's a confusion between height and elevation. I see what you're saying.

Boardmember Sullivan: Those are survey elevation points so they're going to be in relationship to each other. There's ... gosh, what is it, 9-1/2?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Where it says "peak elevation, 16," it's really the height, not the elevation.

Boardmember Sullivan: I guess that's just something to look at.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Do you see it?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I hear what you're saying, and I see it now too.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, 16 is the height.

Male Voice: It's a labeling error.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, it's a labeling error.

Male Voice: It's not an elevation, that's the ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's the height.

Boardmember Sullivan: So unlike the other one ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: You're showing your survey elevations, which is confusing the board as far as the height of the building is concerned.

Boardmember Sullivan: Frankly, it's actually very helpful.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But on one building it says elevation is 25.5, which is correct. On the other it says the elevation is 16; 16 is the height, not the elevation.

Boardmember Sullivan: It's actually helpful, Buddy, to see it. And having the survey points, I wouldn't like to have them go away. They just should be accurate if this is not the case.

I'd like this a little bit smaller; shorter, I should say. I was confused when we got the note about it being decreased from 40 feet to 20 feet. I didn't quite understand that.

Village Attorney Whitehead: A solid wall.

Boardmember Sullivan: The solid wall, I think that was a good effort. I think I like, personally, the wall when it has sort of the higher band all the way across rather than when you come down on the sides. This is on the side towards the parking lot.

Mr. Bernacchia: That side?

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes. I think just carrying that band, the shorter band, from side to side rather than coming down, that would give a sense of separation in a good way from the ...

Mr. Bernacchia: To keep the wall low on the entire side?

Boardmember Sullivan: Keeping the wall higher.

Mr. Bernacchia: Okay. Because that's what we reversed on the last conversation.

Boardmember Sullivan: Pardon me?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Because it was too much wall.

Mr. Bernacchia: Because there was too much wall.

Chairman O'Reilly: Right.

Mr. Bernacchia: Either way, that whole wall is going to be screened in the dimension of the planting area. But, I mean, you will have a lot of greenery right in front of that.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right. I just think if it's made smaller, shorter, it would be helpful. And the length of it, too. I mean, that seems quite a lot. And I don't know if you ...

Mr. Bernacchia: The wall itself, or ...

Boardmember Sullivan: The building itself.

Mr. Bernacchia: Well, I mean, we're trying to max out what we can grow in here and it's ...

Boardmember Sullivan: I guess when we get more information about your growing racks and understand how you're going to lay it out that'd be helpful.

Chairman O'Reilly: I think one of the issues about the 2-foot planting verge along the side, along the car park, if you look at the vegetation there now I think over the years it has deteriorated.

Mr. Bernacchia: Well, they got wiped out by two hurricanes, yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: It probably is caused more by the cars that are going by and the exhaust, the pollution.

Mr. Bernacchia: Yeah. Arborvitaes have a lifespan, and 20 years is about it. They were flat on their backs. We actually propped them up, but two hurricanes did their damage. I wouldn't necessarily use the arborvitaes again, I'd put a mix of what we can do in there.

Chairman O'Reilly: I can't see the ones you put up there, but I was standing on the railway line side of the proposed site and you've got some large vegetation there. Do you have an approximate picture there which would indicate the height of the building above what is currently the vegetation there, if I'm standing in that same spot?

Mr. Bernacchia: If you're looking from the railroad tracks towards ...

Chairman O'Reilly: Towards the river.

Mr. Bernacchia: ... that would be the east side of the garden.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, looking on the narrow side of the building, not the long side of the building. Do you have anything that would indicate that?

Village Attorney Whitehead: There's an east elevation.

Mr. Bernacchia: We're really not seeing it straight on, but that would be ...

Chairman O'Reilly: So where those trees are now, they will remain?

Mr. Bernacchia: Those trees remain.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay.

Mr. Bernacchia: Those are plum trees, a couple of them.

Chairman O'Reilly: So the view of the building from that direction is not going to be that obvious. You'll still be looking at the vegetation which is there.

Mr. Bernacchia: Right.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay. Unless we have any other questions, anyone from the public care to speak?

Boardmember Sullivan: Can I just ask one thing?

Chairman O'Reilly: Oh, you have one more.

Boardmember Sullivan: I appreciate it. You mentioned you're planning on reusing the rainwater in some fashion?

Mr. Bernacchia: Yes.

Boardmember Sullivan: You're showing some cisterns on the drawings, though, some underwater ...

Mr. Bernacchia: Yes, we're going to impound the water and just use the rainwater.

Boardmember Sullivan: So it's stored underground.

Mr. Bernacchia: Yeah.

Boardmember Sullivan: Okay, thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Patrick, I note your comment on this. Did you have anything else to add, based on the discussion?

Planning Consultant Cleary: (Off-mic) identified the changes. I think they were responsive to many of the comments the board raised at the last meeting.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes. As I say, it's much better, a much more agreeable rendering than the first one we had despite the questions that are still on the board's mind, as indicated tonight, about the height and potential pitch of the roof. Something to take under advisement, but also on the plans so there is accuracy in the figures which are shown so they're not confusing ...

Mr. Bernacchia: Sure, okay.

Chairman O'Reilly: ... to the likes of us who try to read some of this. Having said that, anything from the public?

Therefore, I suggest we move on to the next agenda item. Do you have enough feedback, obviously, from what we're doing and know what direction you want to pursue?

Mr. Bernacchia: Yes. Are you asking to revise for another meeting?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Because there's only four members here tonight. You need a majority of the board for an approval. So you would need all four members, and I think you've heard that at least two of the four who are here tonight are not satisfied to the point of, certainly, voting on it. So yes, I think you're going to have to come back.

Mr. Bernacchia: Okay.

Boardmember Sullivan: We also need some more information before voting on it. I mean, there's issues of ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's what I said: you're not ready to vote yet.

Chairman O'Reilly: Not ready to vote.

Boardmember Sullivan: There's certain documentation, a landscape plan, that comes with this, right? As well as some further civil work?

Chairman O'Reilly: Are we up to that point? I mean, we would want to know that eventually.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I don't know that there's any further civil work, you know? I think especially because there's been questions about the planting strip ...

Mr. Bernacchia: Sure.

Village Attorney Whitehead: ... it would be helpful to have an actual planting plan for what you propose to plant there. And something saying they can survive in that 2 feet. That's really it in terms of a landscape plan.

Boardmember Sullivan: Absolutely. Your garden is beyond beautiful.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Whitehead: I kind of trust them with planting.

[laughter]

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: When they come back from the ARB we will already have Hahn's comment for the drainage.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I don't think this is anything complicated in terms of drainage.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: No, not at all. We will move on to that level once they have it more defined.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Do we really need ...

Male Voice: Not really. They've co-opted their stormwater management with cisterns.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes, they're capturing all the stormwater in cisterns. I don't know that it even really needs ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: We'll just have to have Hahn look at it. It's got to go to the ARB anyway.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And it's not ready to go to the ARB.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: No, not quite yet.

Mr. Bernacchia: Okay, thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you.

2. **View Preservation Advisory, Steep Slopes Approval & Site Plan Approval Application of Riverton Lofts West, LLC**

For construction of a new seven-dwelling, multi-family unit on an existing lot with associated parking located at 10 West Main Street. Said property is in the CC Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.70-48-13 on the Village Tax Maps.

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

3. **Site Plan Approval & View Preservation Advisory – Application of 15 Spring Street Realty, LLC**

For demolition of the existing building and construction of a new Structure, creating a mixed-use occupancy to include 10 parking spaces in the basement, two retail spaces on the first level, and six dwelling units on the second and third levels, at their commercial property located at 15 Spring Street. Said property is in the CC Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.30-22-34 on the Village Tax Maps.

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

4. View Preservation Advisory & Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Gabriel & Katalin Ce

For a rear addition and retaining walls on the two-family dwelling located at 280 Warburton Avenue. Said property is located in the R-7.5 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.100-96-11 on the Village Tax Maps.

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

IV. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman O'Reilly: Next, new public hearings: steep slopes approval application of Michael Berger and Janna Rosenberg.

1. Steep Slopes Approval – Application of Michael Berger & Janna Rosenberg

For additions and rear patio on their single-family dwelling on their property at 130 Euclid Avenue. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.20-12-14 on the Village Tax Maps.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Technical difficulties?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: As usual.

Village Attorney Whitehead: How come one of them is on HDMI-2 and the other's on -3?

Boardmember Martin: Depends where they're plugged in.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I just hope nobody hit the wrong one.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: No, I had to change it to -2 for it to work. It was on -1.

Brandon Stewart, Michael Lewis Architects: Okay, if there's too much trouble we've got the old-fashioned way if we need to.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think we should proceed with the old-fashioned one.

Chairman O'Reilly: When you wish to begin please give us your name and affiliation, your role, and also when you're speaking over there please use the handheld mic.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's on.

Mr. Stewart: I'm representing the owners at 130 Euclid Avenue, Janna Rosenberg and Mike Berger. I also have Michael Lewis here with me. I'll just be simply giving an introduction to the project and then Ubadah Abdullah, who's here with us from Hudson Engineering, will be describing the proposed stormwater management and other site protections.

Just a quick run-through on the project. Janna and Mike are moving up from the city with their three children to live closer to family, and they've bought this property. The house, you'll see existing elevations of it. A couple of things that make it not quite big enough for what they need, and we're trying to deal with the nature of the site. As you can see with the three different slope categories, it's quite steep across the entire site. That's the reason we're here is for steep slopes approval.

We are keeping within the existing foundation walls of the basement and they are all to remain. We're building on top of them and not intruding onto the site in any area other than with a few exceptions. One is off to the side; a slight addition to get another bedroom and bathroom. Then you can see as well, here in the back, a small addition for the living room that presses back into the site.

You can see here we have the existing site plan and the proposed site plan. We're fairly well hemmed in by the required setbacks on the front and the two sides. Here, you can see in the proposed, here's that side addition I referred to and here's the rear addition that pops out in the back. Due to the nature of the site we are proposing a stone patio off the kitchen/dining area here that connects to a stone walkway that wraps around our addition and connects with an existing stone patio and pathway that will now come down this side of the house.

As you can see the categories of slope that we're disturbing, you can see the red is 26- to 100 percent slope; the orange is 16- to 25-; and the green is zero- to 15 percent slope. The disturbance of all three categories that we're proposing is all well within the limits prescribed by the Village code.

With that, if there aren't any other general questions about the project I'll turn the time to Ubadah to discuss the proposed site protections. Are there any questions, in general? I guess you've seen these elevations as well. Here's that side addition, and then what you're seeing

are the existing basement walls, to remain. Then the first floor overhangs slightly. Here's the rear. This is looking from the south, and you can see this portion here is what's being added, what's being proposed to be added, with the walkway around. And here's the view of it from the slope, looking at the addition. I guess these are the same. Ubadah can refer you to that.

Ubadah Abdullah, Hudson Engineering: We worked on the stormwater design and the general sediment erosion control measures. With regard to the stormwater design, due to the steep slopes on the site we did do testing to see if we can do infiltration. We did receive the depth and percolation rate. However, due to the steep slopes in this area and the general slope of the roof leaders, one of the areas we would actually be able to capture isn't feasible as, typically, drywells would need to be in slopes of 15 percent or less. Otherwise, there's a possibility of the groundwater bleeding through the sides and just running overland instead of actually infiltrating into the ground.

Instead, we propose an attenuation gallery which would capture the entire roof runoff and the patio runoff, directed to the attenuation gallery, which would control the flows before discharging into the existing Village catch basin at a reduced rate compared to what it does in the existing condition. Then we have, obviously, erosion control measures to capture any sediment runoff going downslope towards the road.

Chairman O'Reilly: Very good.

Mr. Abdullah: Any questions?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yes. Why are you attaching into the Village storm system?

Mr. Abdullah: Where else would we discharge, given infiltration is not feasible on the site? The reality is, runoff from this site would go into the road and eventually into the catch basin. We're just doing it at a more controlled rate to reduce it, compared to what's happening now.

Boardmember Sullivan: What is that basin like? What is it?

Mr. Abdullah: The attenuation gallery? It's a 20-foot 30-inch pipe. So it's a drain pipe, but it's on the south side where the water comes in and fills up the attenuation gallery up to the 25-year storm event to some extent, and slowly releasing it. We did a pre and post study to calculate the numbers compared to what's running off now versus what the runoff would be in the overall site, and then coming ...

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: She can't hear you on microphone.

Mr. Abdullah: Sorry.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Just hold it closer to your mouth, please.

Boardmember Sullivan: Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Chairman O'Reilly: I have no questions on this. Richard?

Boardmember Bass: I'm good.

Chairman O'Reilly: Richard?

Boardmember Martin: I'm good.

Boardmember Sullivan: Has Hahn taken a look at this?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It's been sent to Hahn. We haven't gotten a response from Hahn yet on this. There assumption to use the Village storm system is not something that we normally accept. It has to be approved by the DPW superintendent and approved by Hahn. It's not something that can just be assumed.

Chairman O'Reilly: What would be their choice?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: To take that into consideration.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But there's no prohibition.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: No.

Chairman O'Reilly: Because you have no choice.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It just has to be approved.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Okay, so it should go to Mike.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It has to go to Mike, and it has to go to Hahn.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, Hahn already has it. So it should go to Mike.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Mm-hmm.

Chairman O'Reilly: Patrick, you had a couple of items that you thought needed some slight clarification?

Planning Consultant Cleary: The purpose of the steep slopes ordinance is to (off-mic) the applicant's proposing. The ordinance does establish thresholds within which (off-mic) has to be acceptable, and they're compliant (off-mic) plan. The (off-mic) retaining wall shows at about 6-1/2 feet (off-mic) is critical for us. The height there, if you could verify that. There are two trees that need to be removed.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Now the mic's okay.

Planning Consultant Cleary: There are two trees that need to be removed, one in the rear yard which absolutely would need to be removed for this. But the one in the front yard is adjacent to the attenuation gallery and is a very large pine tree. If that gallery were shifted there's the potential of saving that tree. So if you could consider that and look at that, that might be a benefit.

The code does require a landscaping plan. You should decide if, in fact, one is warranted in this particular instance. And if it is, the code would require you to deal with that. And the code for the steep slope ordinance also requires you to provide a narrative documenting what we're talking about tonight, basically. So a written narrative has to be submitted as well.

Village Attorney Whitehead: There's very specific things in the code that have to be put in writing saying that you've done certain things. So it just needs to be a letter that says those specific things.

Mr. Stewart: Okay. We submitted a letter like that for the Zoning Board. I wasn't aware it was also a requirement for this body. Then there was a narrative also (cross-talk) ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: It has to ... I'm sorry. It just has to say different things.

Mr. Stewart: Oh, okay.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So look at the steep slopes ordinance.

Mr. Stewart: Uh-huh, okay. And then that tree, we would love to keep it. Maybe we'll do what you're saying and try to shift the gallery. We didn't want it to get too close to the setback line or to the sheet. And due to the likely root system we felt it might end up being unavoidable even if we squeeze it all the way to the front. But we will ...

Male Voice: (Off-mic).

Mr. Abdullah: We could do a V to some extent, but at the same time we're trying to maintain that 10-foot separation. And then the roots along the ... trees along the left side.

Chairman O'Reilly: Patrick, you also made comment about the fact that a neighbor has a swimming pool which is located ... that perhaps there could be ...

Planning Consultant Cleary: The addition is moving into the rear yard in close proximity (off-mic) to the landscaping plan. Perhaps there needs to be screening to mitigate either the pool from these folks or these folks from the pool.

Mr. Stewart: Actually these folks are here, I believe.

Village Attorney Whitehead: We'll let the public speak in a second.

Mr. Stewart: Okay, we'll get there. Okay, noted.

Chairman O'Reilly: So in effect, some degree of landscaping plan would be required, or would be advisable.

Planning Consultant Cleary: That's right. I'm anticipating whether there's a familiar relationship between the two and it's ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Pat.

Planning Consultant Cleary: It's a planning issue that you should address, regardless of whether or not they're friends or relatives or what.

Mr. Stewart: And just to be clear, the landscaping plan mostly would be to show any proposed plantings just in this one area because all of the landscaping in the front and all these existing stone steps are all to remain. Everything else on the property is to remain except for, as you mentioned, that ornamental tree here, and possibly this tree. So the landscape plan would be fairly sparse except for possible proposed plantings just on that one area.

Planning Consultant Cleary: That's right. The context of the landscaping plan relates to the steep slope permit. It's not an aesthetic issue necessarily, it relates to mitigating the visual impact created by the impact on the site's steep slopes. So it's limited in that regard.

Mr. Stewart: Okay, great.

Boardmember Sullivan: It might be helpful, if there is a need for a landscape plan, to have whoever prepares it to take a look at the tree in the front and help determine sort of the critical root zone.

Mr. Stewart: If it can be.

Boardmember Sullivan: And see if it can be salvaged. Because it could be a tall pine with a critical root zone like this, or something larger.

Mr. Stewart: Right, okay.

Boardmember Sullivan: It may make it possible or not, depending. So it might be helpful just to have that evaluation, if that could be done.

Mr. Stewart: Okay. And actually there's one pertinent item to the landscape I failed to mention. Which is, currently in this area there's a nonconforming sunroom that extends well into the side setback that we're proposing to be removed. There's a pretty large stone patio that's associated with it, on two sides, that we are proposing to turn into just a flat lawn along this entire side of the house. So that'll show up on the landscaping plan and certainly help to mitigate any erosion issues in that area.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you. Do we have any questions? If not, if anyone from the public is here to speak on this issue, this project. You were standing up.

Boardmember Sullivan: Say name and ...

Gary Rosenberg: We live in the adjoining house with the pool. It's my daughter and son-in-law, with our grandchildren, who are moving in.

From our point of view, certainly removing the nonconforming house on the side is a great improvement. The screened-in porch, which certainly was built without anybody knowing about it. And certainly whatever landscaping is needed – if you take a look at the house adjoining and the landscaping we have – we expect to be extending that onto this property so that we think it'll be certainly an addition to the neighborhood. Neighbors were wonderful before. We think this will be much more in keeping with the neighborhood when this house is renovated.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you. Anyone else?

Sebastian Fries: My family lives right next door to the property. I don't know if this is the right time to ask questions about the variance for the front of the building or any other points, or if that's another hearing.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's the Zoning Board meeting, really, for the variance on the front.

Mr. Stewart: I think the date is September 4. It probably shows in the letter.

Mr. Fries: I saw something in the mailing, I just wasn't sure ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: September 5 is the Zoning Board meeting, and they'll be addressing the front yard variance.

Mr. Fries: Thank you for that.

Chairman O'Reilly: They need to come back, I assume.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: With that in mind, you have our feedback. You have a little work to do there, and we will hear from you at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Stewart: I guess we'll still anticipate possible comments from Hahn?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yes.

Mr. Stewart: Between now and then.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You'll have them before the next Planning Board meeting. And Buddy, they can still go ahead at the Zoning Board because the steep slopes has nothing to do with the variance. They're separate.

Mr. Stewart: So just to recap, landscape plan and narrative according to what's prescribed: those are the major requirements, correct?

Village Attorney Whitehead: And Hahn's comments. Buddy will make sure the plan also go to Public Works so they can comment.

Mr. Stewart: And the tree.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And look at the pine tree.

Mr. Stewart: Okay.

Chairman O'Reilly: And verification of the height of that rear wall, that it's 6-1/2.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Make sure it does not exceed, at any point, 6-1/2 feet.

Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay?

Mr. Stewart: Great, thank you.

Boardmember Sullivan: I want to just make a comment. These drawings were very clear, and I like how you did the pull-out – the sort of footprint – and sort of isolated it. I think that's a just a very good example that we may want to share with other people. It was very easy to understand what you were actually disturbing. So thank you for that.

Male Voice: (Off-mic).

Mr. Stewart: Thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay, time for the changeover.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's what everybody was here for.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes. Our next item is a re-subdivision approval. Excuse me?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Could you talk out in the hallway?

Chairman O'Reilly: Take your conversations ... gentlemen, ladies, take your conversations outside, please. Thank you. All good.

2. [Re-subdivision Approval – Application of Jonah & Randi Finkelstein for a lot line adjustment.](#)

Said properties are located at 1 Ashley Road & 25 Branford Road. The properties are located in the R-10 Zoning District and are known as SBL: 4.110-118-9 & 4.120-133-5 on the Village Tax Maps.

Chairman O'Reilly: I see Mr. Weinstein ready to speak, but you need to ...

Edward Weinstein, Weinstein Architecture & Planning: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. I'm here representing Mr. and Mrs. Finkelstein. I've prepared this additional diagram, but the computer doesn't seem to be working. I hope I can explain it very simply.

This is a no-work application. There is absolutely nothing happening except moving a property line. The Finkelsteins currently own both of these parcels; 1 Ashley, and 25 Branford Road. Right now, 25 Branford is vacant; 1 Ashley is occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Finkelstein. They would ...

Chairman O'Reilly: Could I just ask you when you're identifying on your nice little graphic there which one is Ashley and which one is Branford?

Mr. Weinstein: Okay, Ashley is currently the smaller lot; Branford is currently the larger lot. In the proposed, the Ashley property would become a through lot extending from Ashley to Branford. The primary motivation is to preserve the open space and woods in the rear of that property. Right now, the Ashley property has the apparent benefit of the open space and the woods in the rear, but not the real benefit because the owner of 25 Branford could have done something with that ... you know, not necessarily ... he couldn't really subdivide it to build another home without variances.

The Finkelsteins intend to continue living in the Ashley home. There is a brook that runs through both properties, extends from Ashley to Branford. The new property line is going to keep the brook on the Ashley property. And at the end of the day, we provided a zoning analysis. After all is said and done, there are two existing nonconformities which are not changing since this is a no-work: 1 Ashley has an insufficient front yard, Branford has an insufficient side yard. We're not changing that; that will continue to be the same. And all of the other yards we're creating as a result of the new lot lines will be compliant, as will minimum lot size, frontage, and coverage. So just asking for your approval to move a lot line.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay. And why did you say they wanted to do it?

Mr. Weinstein: To preserve the open space behind the house where they live. They live at 1 Ashley. It's a thickly wooded area to the rear, and they want to own that so they can keep it that way.

Chairman O'Reilly: Right. And to the right of 25 Branford is an open space on a flat area. That's where the brook is?

Mr. Weinstein: Yeah, this is the new lot line. So the brook is just inside this lot line on the Ashley property. It meanders a bit, but the new lot line will keep it entirely on the Ashley property.

Boardmember Bass: And the intent is to sell the smaller new reconfigured lot?

Mr. Weinstein: The intent would be to sell the Branford property. In fact, it's on the market.

Chairman O'Reilly: There's no likelihood of creating another building lot on Branford because it's too narrow.

Mr. Weinstein: That's correct. Both of the lots, you know ... well, the Branford lot will be just over the minimum required size. The Ashley lot will be larger, but the geometry would not allow it to be reapportioned again to create a separate building lot. And they have no intent to do that.

Planning Consultant Cleary: And moreover, Mr. Chairman, I think the presence of the brook would be an environmental constraint on that property that would probably also prohibit a new home from being constructed in that area.

Chairman O'Reilly: Yes, it's a cute little area.

Planning Consultant Cleary: It is, right? You don't realize who owned that piece of woods, right? They're trying to clear that up.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That's why they're buying it.

Mr. Weinstein: And someone, one day, will have to explain to me what a "fenway" is because there's a street around the corner that is called "*The Fenway*."

Chairman O'Reilly: The Fenway. I have no real questions on this. It's an interesting effort. Let me start on the right this time. Kathleen.

Boardmember Sullivan: So this is an R-10 or ...

Mr. Weinstein: R-10.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, I have no questions. It's just interesting that it's going to be, potentially, a double lot?

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's a through lot.

Boardmember Sullivan: Through lot, but it's one that has some constraints. I just wonder in the future if those constraints will be discussed in front of a planning board at some point. But I don't have any other questions.

Chairman O'Reilly: Well, there's not much else you can do with it.

Richard.

Boardmember Martin: Anybody from the public have any ...

Chairman O'Reilly: We'll get to them after you.

Boardmember Martin: No questions.

Boardmember Bass: I'm good.

Chairman O'Reilly: Okay. Anyone from the public interested in this issue?

Do we have enough information, therefore, to vote on the proposal?

Planning Consultant Cleary: You do, Mr. Chairman. Again, this is fully compliant, meets all the zoning requirements and those two nonconformities that Ed described for preexisting legal nonconformities.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You do need to do a SEQRA on this, so you would need to do a negative declaration.

Planning Consultant Cleary: It's an unlisted action and you would need to review. So two votes, Mr. Chairman. One would be an adoption of a negative declaration, and the second would be the granting of the reapportionment.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And they have provided a Short EAF.

Chairman O'Reilly: I saw that, yes. I have no questions on that. Therefore the first part of it would be to approve a negative declaration, if someone can find the wording.

On MOTION of Boardmember Bass, SECONDED by Boardmember Martin, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved to approve the negative declaration under SEQRA.

Chairman O'Reilly: Unanimous. That's approved.

The second one is to approve the redesign or the subdivision ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Re-subdivision.

Chairman O'Reilly: Re-subdivision, as stated in the request. And therefore I ask for a motion to approve.

On MOTION of Boardmember Martin, SECONDED by Boardmember Bass, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board resolved to approve the re-subdivision.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you.

Mr. Weinstein: Thank you.

Chairman O'Reilly: Thank you very much.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You own your woods.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Climate-Smart Communities

Chairman O'Reilly: I know it says that there are no discussion items on the agenda, but we finished in fairly good time. I did promise Kathleen some time for discussion of a particular item which she has information on which relating to the climate. Introduce it, if you would.

Boardmember Sullivan: The Conservation Commission is shepherding a process through the Village which is taking advantage of us being a certified climate-smart community. In it, there's a real effort focused on trying to get to a certain level of certification. The goals are for reducing greenhouse gas and also to be adaptable to climate change.

It's through the DEC and it's quite an elaborate process. They've had two sort of public meetings, and listening to people speak I've reached out to the two chairs and offered a chance for the Planning Board maybe to take a look at some of the initiatives. There may be things we would like to undertake as one of the actions for us sort of jumping up a couple rungs on the sort of process. Or also to be available for grants which the DEC has put out there for people to try to do.

It's been in play for quite a while. Patrick and Linda are probably aware of it. We have been, I think, as a community sort of certified. But there's just a real effort to go ahead and start to obtain points to be able to be available for some grants, as well as to take a look at some of the things we can do as a community. What's missing – I found from being at one of the meetings – was someone from a board who might have more of a land use or climate change perspective. Because the conservation group, as people know, is very active on a huge number of initiatives. They have done so much to sort of push us forward in sustainability.

But what I'd love to do is circulate sort of some of the information that I've received and then just see what people think of it. One thing that jumped out from looking at this – because I

know we talked about it quite a bit as a board – is that one of the initiatives is to deal with parking requirements in a community. We've talked about it and we've sort of been batted down by the Zoning Board. But if there's a way to sort of focus on it, change the law, find out if we need help, maybe there's a way we go for a grant to try to get some assistance. I'm not even sure how we go about it

There are two sections that I think probably we could be very helpful in doing because of being more from a land use side. One of them was to implement climate-smart land use. There's a number of items they have. The other one involves being involved with being able to enhance community resilience to climate change, which may be some land use and other kinds of things as well.

So I just wanted to share that with you. I think it's kind of exciting. I've worked with the conservation people in a workshop that dealt with this so I think it just would be a really nice way to sort of, again, put our focus on it and see if there's some things that we've talked about doing to try to not have to deal with over-parking.

Planning Consultant Cleary: I think, Kathleen, what that translates into from your perspective is the land use component of this. Which means adopting lane-use rules and regulations.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Policies, yes.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Exactly right. Richard mentioned earlier the ability to build a mixed-use building in the hub of the community.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right.

Planning Consultant Cleary: That may require zoning amendments to do it, but that's a climate-smart strategy. So those are the types of things you would embed in the zoning code. That raises you up on the rungs, as you indicated earlier. And I will say the DEC is eager to fund communities that do this. So there's money out there, we just need to get up higher on the ladder.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And some of it could be for a planning exercise. Just the most recent thing that comes to mind is that you sent 10 West Main off with a request for a larger parking variance ...

Boardmember Sullivan: Right, exactly.

Village Attorney Whitehead: ... and the Zoning Board came back and said no, we're not giving that big a variance. So maybe it's looking at changing the parking requirements in the

code, making a TOD parking requirement.

Boardmember Sullivan: Right, perfect. Exactly.

Village Attorney Whitehead: So some of the funds could even be used for a planning study of parking requirements throughout your code where maybe you look at reducing some of them and that reduces impervious surface.

Boardmember Sullivan: Yes, exactly.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And encourage TOD development.

Chairman O'Reilly: I think that'd be great.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think we might find a few things in here.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: A perfect example is 10 West Main Street.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right, where they created more impervious surface by not giving as big a parking variance. Whereas if the code had a TOD parking ... a lesser requirement. And that's something that's being done in codes throughout the county right now. They're starting to adopt TOD provisions with lower parking.

Boardmember Sullivan: They have a lot of information on the Web site. I printed this part out, which is that they have a lot of ...

Planning Consultant Cleary: **Chairman O'Reilly:** I know it says that there are no discussion items on the agenda, but we finished in fairly good time. I did promise Kathleen some time for discussion of a particular item which she has information on which relating to the climate.

Boardmember Martin: TOD?

Village Attorney Whitehead: Transit Oriented Development.

Boardmember Sullivan: They have a PDF listing all the issues if you wanted to deal with green parking lot standards.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Why don't you send around the link.

Boardmember Sullivan: I will.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The links to the Planning Board.

Boardmember Sullivan: So I just want to share this. There's a ton of information. I would like to make a thought, a request. I think we probably should also look at enhanced community resilience to climate change. There are some things in there that are land use, as well, and we should just take a look and see if there's anything we might want to add to our list. There's some things that are talking about conserving wetlands and forests, and doing sort of natural resources surveys. There are issues of talking about how to potentially plan better at the waterfront, as well.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Well, you've heard an example this evening. You've heard Harvest say their landscaping was devastated twice by two storms. This selection of plant materials to be more durable is a method to deal with that. So instead of tonight saying, well, put a couple of arborvitae that can screen the greenhouse better, the selection of those plants to be sustainable is also an objective in addition to just screening the building.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And you could develop, work with, the landscape architect and develop a plant list that's recommended in those parts of the Village that are more storm-resilient.

Planning Consultant Cleary: Right, that can survive under 10 feet of the Hudson River.

Boardmember Sullivan: And there's some things about maybe working to get green infrastructure in for stormwater. You know, just looking at that as well. Anyways, I'd just love to share it and see what people think. I don't really know how to engage when the timing is. I think they're sort of ... my understanding is that the conservation committee is trying to document everything the Village has done to date and sort of get that up there to sort of start seeing where we sit.

Planning Consultant Cleary: And that's great.

Boardmember Sullivan: I think they're open to new initiatives. I mentioned to Sharon Kivowitz, who's the chair, that we're also interested maybe in helping look at grants, making a project for the grants, as well. Anyway, very exciting and a lot of energy from people in the Village, too – new people that have moved into the Village – who say, Heck, I moved to Hastings and found out I don't get plastic bags at the grocery store; I think this is a great place to live. So let's get rid of some ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Pretty soon you won't get plastic bags anywhere in New York State.

Chairman O'Reilly: What's going to happen to Stu Leonard's?

Boardmember Bass: They give out paper now. They give out paper bags, but you have to ask for them.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I mean, it's really all about encouraging reusable.

Boardmember Sullivan: It'd be nice to encourage not having as many parking spaces, too.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And it matters less in Hastings, but I know in another town where Pat works he actually did a study of all the commercial parking requirements and reduced them because Harrison was horribly over-parked. There's not a lot of big commercial parking lots in Hastings.

Planning Consultant Cleary: And the notion of TOD – transit oriented, putting this near the place where you don't need to drive – you don't need a parking space.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right. And what the studies really are showing is that in TOD developments have fewer cars. You're finding more people with only one car per family.

Planning Consultant Cleary: They choose to be there so they don't have to have a second car.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Right. A lot of younger people, if they commute to the city then they only have to own one car. They love only owning one car.

Chairman O'Reilly: The community gets upset if we try to give a variance because they think they're supposed to have two cars. If you tell somebody you can only have one car in an apartment they'll but it or they won't buy it.

Having said that, thank you, Kathleen. I think it's something to keep us informed with, and we'll try and keep up with it.

Boardmember Sullivan: Just take a look and see what people would be interested in.

Boardmember Bass: And I'll share that with the Waterfront Zoning Committee.

2. Architectural Review Board Liaison

Chairman O'Reilly: The last little item, I just wanted to say, is that before I became chair I was going to meetings of the Architectural Review Board. We need a liaison to the Architectural Review Board, which is quite fun when they have something good to do, which

it is. I prefer to pass that over to somebody else at this point so I'm looking for a volunteer.

Village Attorney Whitehead: We're missing a few people tonight.

Chairman O'Reilly: And we're missing a few people, so I just mention it.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You know that when someone doesn't show up they get volunteered for things.

Boardmember Martin: What's the last name over there?

Chairman O'Reilly: Ambrozek, or Debra.

Boardmember Sullivan: She would love the job, I know.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Well, did you go to all the meetings or just when there was something on that was also coming to planning?

Chairman O'Reilly: I went to the ones I could go to when it landed on a night that I could go. Monday nights were not really very good for me. I think I went to about three meetings. They *were* interesting.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And it's probably most important when there's a project that you're also reviewing.

Chairman O'Reilly: Right, because they're basically ...

Village Attorney Whitehead: Advisory.

Chairman O'Reilly: ... advising the Planning Board. We hear nothing back, and it's sort of useful to be connected. I do want to raise that if anybody here tonight wishes to volunteer, but I'll raise it again when we have a full quorum.

Boardmember Bass: I'm just in a phase of multiple night meetings for the next six, nine months.

Chairman O'Reilly: Did you say "night beatings?"

Boardmember Bass: Night meetings.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Only for the next six, nine months? That's my *life*."

Boardmember Bass: Well, it may be my life, but I'm planning two sites in New Jersey so

I'm commuting there. So they should be done.

Boardmember Sullivan: So "no" is what you're saying.

Boardmember Bass: Right.

[laughter]

Village Attorney Whitehead: Not Richard.

Boardmember Bass: Ask me in a year.

Chairman O'Reilly: All right, I just raised it but I'll bring it up again.

Planning Consultant Cleary: In six or nine months you get done?

Boardmember Bass: The client wants it get it done by October.

Chairman O'Reilly: A move to adjourn. I made a note to say that.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

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

Chairman O'Reilly: Unanimous.