. X

TRANSCRIPT OF

TOWN OF EASTCHESTER

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

MARCH 4, 2021

. X

Eastchester Town Clerk
MAR 30 2021 AM 9:46

ZOOM MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

LAURA RAFFIANI, CHAIRPERSON
ENDA MCINTYRE, MEMBER
JENNIFER NEMECEK, MEMBER
SILVIO LUCA, MEMBER

TOWN OF EASTCHESTER
Building and Planning Department
MAR 30 2021
RECEIVED

EASTCHESTER EMPLOYEES IN ATTENDANCE:

MARGARET UHLE, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

Dina M. Morgan, Reporter
25 Colonial Road
Bronxville, New York 10708
(914) 469-6353

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the Architectural Review Board meeting for the town of Eastchester for -- I always do this, I read the date you wrote this, Margaret -- for March 4th, 2021.

If you would, Margaret, please do the roll call.

MS. UHLE: Sure. Enda McIntyre.

MR. MCINTYRE: Here.

MS. UHLE: Jennifer Nemecek.

MR. NEMECEK: Here.

MS. UHLE: Silvio Luca. I'm sorry, you're muted, Silvio.

MR. LUCA: Here.

MS. UHLE: Laura Raffiani.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Present.

MS. UHLE: Carlos Garcia-Bou cannot make it this evening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The minutes from February I was not in attendance, so --

MS. UHLE: We can hold those off because Carlos is not here. So we'll wait until next month.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Very good. Just some notes, some comments about how you can participate in the public hearing part of the meeting. If anyone is here in our audience, our virtual audience from the Town, if you would like to make a comment during the public hearing, you use the raise hand feature on Zoom or star 9 if you're calling in from a phone. So either the hand raise feature or star 9. Margaret will acknowledge you, invite you to speak, and at that point please un-mute your microphone and state your name and address.

With that, I think we can proceed with tonight's business. First up on the agenda is Application 21-09 for 32 Scarsdale Avenue. Do we have the presenters?

MS. UHLE: Yes. There we go.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Welcome. Dennis, you need to un-mute, please. John, are you un-muted?

MR. COTUGNO: Yes. Can you hear me?

THE CHAIRPERSON: I can hear you. I can also see the top of your head.

MR. COTUGNO: I'll change it to the

drawing, which is much better than the top of my head, I hope.

I'm John Cotugno. I'm the architect for the Murrays for 32 Scarsdale Avenue. This is for a two story addition on the left side of the house and a small portico over the front entry. Can you see the drawings now?

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm not seeing them yet. Margaret, how do we get to the point where we're off to the side?

MS. UHLE: When John goes to share his drawings, that will happen.

MR. COTUGNO: I did.

MS. UHLE: We're not seeing them, though, John, so there is something else you need to do.

MR. COTUGNO: I'm sorry, I'm a little bit of a novice. So I'm back to you guys. No, I'm not back to you. I'm sorry. Bear with me.

I'm back with you guys. I'm about to press share screen.

MS. UHLE: Good. Yes.

MR. COTUGNO: It's on now. That's the title sheet. It just has the zoning analysis,

that kind of stuff, the calculations for the gross floor area. These are the floor plans and the site plan where you could see hatched in on the site plan on the left side where we're doing this two story addition. It's directly over a patio. The patio is very large, so we'll still have a decent size patio after this two story addition. The addition is off of the kitchen, and it will be a family room on the first floor and an extended bedroom on the second floor.

Looking at the elevations, of course all the materials will match the existing. The Murrays decided to re-side -- it has vinyl siding now, they're going to re-side the entire house with gray vinyl siding, this way it all matches properly and, of course, the asphalt shingles will match as well. There is a stone retaining wall in the front, but that doesn't get affected. The addition is built right basically on top of that. Like I said, there's a gable roof portico over the front door, and we do have the same roof pitch on the dormer on the second story addition. We carried over the

skirt, so-to-speak, that the house has now separating the first floor to the second floor, and the ridge height will match the existing, as shown on here.

I think that's all I have to say, so I'll take any questions you guys have.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Are the shutters existing, John, or is that a new addition? The shutters are there already?

MR. COTUGNO: The shutters are there now on the second floor. There's the window on the back with shutters. Right now, we're reusing the same patio doors, and, of course, there are no shutters there, there are no shutters on the second story window over here. So it's a little bit of a hodge podge. While there are shutters on the house on the front, those are symmetrical, but then there's this bay window in the front now that's existing. This is the only change to the house where it says addition in the front on the left side. It's just over that 30 percent threshold for coming to you guys.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So that will have

the shutters to match kind of whatever is on the second floor?

MR. COTUGNO: Yes, on the second floor, because there are shutters on the second floor, so we'll put shutters here to match the existing shutters.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The plain of that addition, that part of the addition, the gable, that is a little bit closer to us; right?

MR. COTUGNO: Yes. It projects closer to the street than the house does, that's why you get bigger windows, which is required, egress windows for the bedroom, that's why it juts into this roof over here. You can see with the pointer; right?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR. COTUGNO: The pointer, you could see that?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. If you could just scroll a little bit further down because we're missing kind of like the bottom part of the page. I'm just not sure if there's something there we should be seeing. Yes, the lower right-hand corner. Is there any

important information there on that sketch?

MR. COTUGNO: Not really. That's the rear elevation.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, got it.

Board members, are there any other questions for this applicant? Make sure to un-mute if you have anything to say or ask.

MR. MCINTYRE: Can you just scroll down and let's look at the roof plan for a second, John, please.

MR. COTUGNO: The roof plan?

MR. MCINTYRE: Yes. Don't you have a section through the --

MR. COTUGNO: Yes. This section?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Scroll up you mean?

MR. COTUGNO: Yes, scroll up, not scroll down. This is the section.

THE CHAIRPERSON: You want to see the bottom half of that page? There you go.

MR. MCINTYRE: So that's the top of the ridge.

MR. COTUGNO: Yes, we're matching the ridge.

MR. MCINTYRE: So your section is cut

right through the top of the ridge.
MR. COTUGNO: Correct, yes, which matches the peak of the house. This is the roof line beyond.
MR. MCINTYRE: Right. So there's no flat roof per se?
MR. COTUGNO: No flat roof, right, correct. That's why that section was taken. Right through here, right through here. Got it?
MR. MCINTYRE: Right.
MR. COTUGNO: The roof line beyond is this angle here. When you're taking it through the dormer, it looks like a flat roof because it's cut right through here. This is the roof line that you see, that same angle the house has now, then it goes back, the house. That's the shape of the house now. This is like a split level house. It's not a typical two story. The floor level here is a half story higher than the first floor, then you walk up another flight of stairs.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Front to back?
MR. COTUGNO: It's a split level front

to back, this house.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
MR. MCINTYRE: So it's just really the kitchen, family room, the new addition, and a second floor bedroom; right?
MR. COTUGNO: Right. Correct.
MR. MCINTYRE: Okay.
THE CHAIRPERSON: John, are there any other like -- is it necessary for any HVAC additions or other, you know, mechanical kind of things you have to do because of the addition?
MR. COTUGNO: No. We're going to tap off of the existing system.
THE CHAIRPERSON: And it's sufficient?
MR. COTUGNO: We're going to use the existing system.
THE CHAIRPERSON: And you don't have to relocate any outdoor stuff?
MR. COTUGNO: No. It must be in the back because I never saw it when I was over here.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Alrighty. Folks, any questions? If not, I'm going to

open up for the public hearing.
So I would like to make a motion to open Application 21-09 for a public hearing.
MR. MCINTYRE: Second.
THE CHAIRPERSON: All in favor.
(AYE)
MS. UHLE: If anyone wants to talk or has any comments, please raise your hand.
It does not appear that anyone has any comments or questions.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. When Margaret says -- just an FYI -- when she says raise your hand, that means not physically raise your hand, but press that button that says raise hand.
So if there's no one there who wishes to ask questions or comments about this application, then I would like to make a motion to close the public hearing for Application 21-09.
MR. MCINTYRE: Second.
THE CHAIRPERSON: All in favor.
(AYE)
THE CHAIRPERSON: Very good.

Alrighty. Any other further comments or questions from the board? Guys, no?
MR. MCINTYRE: No. It's straightforward.
THE CHAIRPERSON: I think we can move this application on to the Planning Board. Margaret, I don't think there were any comments or questions for the Planning Board to take note of?
MS. UHLE: No.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. So then I would like to make a motion to send Application 21-09 along to the Planning Board with a recommendation of approval.
MR. MCINTYRE: Second.
THE CHAIRPERSON: All in favor.
(AYE)
THE CHAIRPERSON: Alrighty. Thank you very much, John. Thank you, Murrays. Good luck with your new home.
MR. MURRAY: Thank you so much.
THE CHAIRPERSON: The next application we have tonight is Application 19-42, which is the property located 5 Ray Place.

MS. UHLE: I'm getting them on board, hold on.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Welcome to the meeting tonight.

MR. SARACENO: Hello, everybody.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Hello, John.

MR. SARACENO: How are you?

THE CHAIRPERSON: All righty, and hello, Edmund.

MR. VOGEL: How are you, everyone? Margaret, whenever you say we're ready.

MS. UHLE: Do you have everyone from your team up? The list that was provided is slightly different from who's here. You have a couple of people numerous times. Natalie is not on your team, is she?

MR. VOGEL: Not that I'm aware.

MS. UHLE: That was a mistake I made. Hold.

MR. VOGEL: Dan Tartaglia might be joining.

MS. UHLE: I don't see him here.

THE CHAIRPERSON: John has three devices?

MR. SARACENO: I had Zoom problems. I'm on one device three times. I tried to close it, but so far unsuccessful.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Margaret can close two out of three.

MS. UHLE: Shall I try to close a couple of those, John?

MR. SARACENO: Sure, go for it. Unless I get to vote on things, then I would like to leave three open.

MS. UHLE: I think that should be -- what happened to Rick? Is Rick just calling in?

MR. SARACENO: I think Rick is just watching.

MS. UHLE: Okay. I guess you're ready, Ed.

MR. VOGEL: Thank you, Margaret. Good evening, members of the board. My name is Ed Vogel. I'm with Warshauer Mellusi Warshauer Architects, and we will be presenting the architectural portion for 5 Ray Place. With us today, you met John Saraceno, he's with Augustus Development, as being the owner and

developer of the project, and Rick Bohlander is from JMC, he's just watching the program, the site engineers for the project.

At this point, I'll share my screen, and we can begin with an overview of the project. We do have an animation toward the end to walk through as well. Bear with me a moment. Here we go.

This is 5 Ray Place. It is obviously in the town of Eastchester. We'll begin to speak about the architecture as we go through the project. Allow me then to just work my way through the slides. The project is located off of Ray Place, which is near the intersection of White Plains Road and Brook Street. The project is situated between the commercial core and a residential neighborhood, which is further to the south and to the west of the project. The zone that we're in is an RB zone, but we elected to utilize the M-700, which is a multi-family residential zone. It's actually well placed as a traditional zone element between the commercial strip and then the residential, which is just to the south and

west. There is a few buildings that house residential right next door that border us as neighbors. To the south of us is the DeCicco's Supermarket, which just recently opened. Just to the north of us is a CVS, and this is their parking field. We'll just zoom into the site a little bit here. So you'll see that Ray Place has an interesting topography. As one rides up Ray Place to the south, it crests up to a knoll that exists naturally in the terrain. The site itself is stepped with retaining walls and some rock out crops. We've nestled the project into those existing terrain conditions. There are two existing parking lots currently there. There's what we call the lower lot, and then we have an upper lot. The upper lot is connected to a larger surface lot with a property owner just to the south of us. So I'm utilizing the driveway and utilizing the grade as it is at Ray Place for the upper level of our parking. I just want to also note that the RB zone line runs just to the south and west, and then there's the R-6 zone, which is the residential area that I mentioned, single family homes.

Because of that, there is a setback, and it crosses over our property, which is where my cursor is right now going, and goes around the corner, so it's only partially over the building.

These are the unit floor plans, and I'm going to zoom in a little bit. So as I mentioned, the first floor plan, as we travel up Ray Place, this is the approximate location of the existing parking lot entry, and then we provided parking at that level as well. Part of the parking goes beyond the building footprint, so the building itself above is as we follow the cursor. We have lobby and entry, we have an exit stair. As we work to our second floor, you enter at that upper level of the parking, and then we slide under the building with additional parking. Again, we have our elevator lobby for the residence, trash compactor and building services. Here you could see the stair arrangement, one next to the elevator and one, as mentioned, down below.

Once we get above the second floor,

the third floor and fifth floors are the residential floors. There are 7 dwelling units on a floor. The building contains 21 units. Out of the 21, 18 are 1 bedroom and 3 are 2 bedroom, making a total of the 21 units. This just happens to be the fifth floor. We do have a roof amenity, as you can see here off to the side. So the features of the elevator and the two exit stairs do crest up onto our roof, and this will be where the mechanicals and then a roof terrace and some green roof will occur.

I'm showing here that arced line, which was the setback from the residential zone over onto our RB or M700 zone. That relates to this diagram here, which is just a diagram indicating how average grade was calculated. Since we have the setback from the residential zone, we did two different calculations, one for the underlying base zone as we come across the four corners, and then we have a second average grade calculation, which is just in the setback area.

To describe the building in section, we have this down here as a diagram. Parking

on that first floor as you can see how we relate to the existing grade. Second floor relates to that upper parking field. Three levels of apartments, and then the roof terrace. There are some retaining walls along the site, and we're trying to honor those retaining walls that cross our site and border our site to minimize our impact to the surrounding properties.

This sheet describes or shows the units that are planned. Basically, they're all one bedroom units. They range in size from 700 to 800 square feet. Then there are 3, 2 bedroom units, and they're roughly 1,000 square feet in size.

Our elevations. The elevations are of a traditional spot. They are very formal, and they are residential in character. The building itself is divided horizontally in the traditional three methods. We have a base, we have a body, and then we have a top or a crown. The top or crown is the roof where the mansard is. The facades are broken vertically by holding strong corners and aligning our

windows. The center one here starts to work and highlight our entry into the building. Vertically, we're punctuated by the window bands and the windows then align. The materials that you see here, the base is a rusticated stone, it's a concrete veneer, veneer brick. We have brick comprising the body of the building. The top is a metal panel. The windows are a double hung, and they're mullion, and they're black in color. The rest of the trim in here is white AZEK. There is some cornice work that divides the base and the crown to reinforce the horizontality of those elements.

Since the building is uniquely situated on the hill, we've taken the opportunity to elevate and design all four elevations. So you can see here what we call the west elevation on the front, and then we work our way to the south, again we're holding the strong corners, we have the horizontal striation, and then our vertical elements. This is the parking I was mentioning before from that upper level here.

The east elevation picks up those same elements, holding the two strong corners, and you could see here the existing retaining wall that exists on the site.

Then our north elevation picks up the same elements as you see working your way around.

This is a rendering looking from Ray Place toward our building. This picks up the materials that I mentioned earlier on the facades. It gives you a better representation of this in three dimensions.

I'm going to move on to a view that we had developed from the CVS parking lot, which is more or less the intersection of Brook Street and White Plains Road toward the project site.

A material finish board. Here the board is representing what I described earlier. We have a white brick. You could see the more rusticated and a little bit deeper layer base, and you could see a metal panel for the roof. Let me reduce this a bit so you can see the bottom. We have black for the windows.

There's an image in the lower right-hand corner for that as well. Then we had some white trim, and then the cornice work would be the Fypon material.

The Planning Board, when we first went to them, thought the color scheme was a little stark and white, so we decided to come up with a second, alternative color scheme where we've reduced or darkened the roof; this is more of a slate color. The brick that comes up the corners here has more of a cream, it's more of a softer white to it, and then in the body between our strong corners, we've changed the materials here, and the material has become a cementitious siding such as a Hardie siding; this is cobblestone in color. So although it is light, it is more toward the tannish range. Then we also have the trim being the cornice remains the same, and the black for the windows.

We were also asked through the Zoning Board process to show some site neighborhood sections. There is a section that is cut from east to west looking in a southerly direction

towards DeCicco's. As we work from left to right across this section, this here is White Plains Road. These are picking up the street shape and vocabulary along White Plains in our vicinity. This is a retaining wall and DeCicco's here. In the background and then in brown you see our structure. Ray Place runs up and down. Then you can see the contours as it transitions to The Enclave, which is our neighbor just to the west.

This is a neighborhood site section here. We're in a north/south line looking in a westerly direction cut through our site. Again from left to right, DeCicco's with the parking fields, and then our parking field. You could see the retaining walls that we have on site. In the background here is The Enclave. You could see the line of The Enclave as it's dashed in beyond our building, the CVS, and then the street vocabulary for Brook Street.

These are a couple of stills right now from an animation that John Meyer Consulting put together, JMC. These were probably the more talked about views, so we provided them in

our presentation as we've been making them to various boards. This is looking up Ray Place. You're looking at 5 Ray Place on the left here, and then you're looking at The Enclave here as the neighbor.

The next viewpoint is from the intersection of Brook and White Plains Road. You see the CVS in the foreground, and then you see 5 Ray Place in the background.

Then directly across the street, across the street being White Plains Road, this is the parking field of the CVS. You can see the retaining work that exists here, and then the walls that exist partially on our site and then partially off of our site.

At this point, I would like to move on to the animation. It is worth showing. So this is an aerial bird's eye view from the south looking north. As we swing a little bit to the west, the property is right here, DeCicco's, The Enclave. Now we're going to start to bring you down onto Brook Street. You'll get a sense of the street shape. Then we're going to rotate toward Ray Place, and

then travel up Ray Place. You can see here The Enclave as our neighbor. We're going to spin you around and then work our way back a little bit to get you to the top of the knoll. Once we're there, we'll bring you back down Ray Place past our building. As we get to the intersection with Brook Street, we'll turn ourselves to take a look at the building, and then we'll travel Brook Street toward the intersection of White Plains Road. Once we reach the intersection with White Plains Road, we'll turn in a southerly direction and go past our site. Then we'll jump to the other side of the street and then travel northerly back toward the intersection with Brook Street. That's where the animation will turn and end.

So at this point, that was the architectural portion of the presentation. I would ask if you have any questions, this would be a time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The animation, I know it's not like perfect exact, but as far as like the colors and finishes, is that one of the first iterations, one of the last

iterations? I'm not sure if I quite know what I'm looking at in terms of the materials on that.

MR. VOGEL: Sure. Well as we described, it is the second board, finish board that I had shown, exterior finish board. It's hard in animation to actually pick up the materials exactly, but that's what we were aiming toward, to fill that distinction between the corners and the body itself.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So there is the two tone of the second board and the darker roof as well?

MR. VOGEL: Correct. Exactly.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Could we go to that board again?

MR. VOGEL: Sure. Bear with me a moment.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure.

MR. VOGEL: Here we go.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. That metal roof, it has that kind of honeycomb-ish feel?

MR. VOGEL: Correct.

THE CHAIRPERSON: And it's got texture

as well; right?

MR. VOGEL: It has texture, right. It's got what's called an orange peel texture to it.

MR. MCINTYRE: I have a question, Edmond. First of all, I think you did a really good job walking us through the project, you know, giving us a pretty in depth sort of perspective of, you know, your I guess process and the design, and I certainly would like to commend you for that.

To my colleague's point, it looks like from this mood board or presentation board, that this mansard roof slate -- is that a panelized system where, you know, the -- I guess the look you're going for, does that come in panels or individual slate? I certainly do like the architecture, I do like the look of it, I think it's very well appointed, but I just kind of want to understand this a little bit better. It looks like there's almost like a semigloss finish on this. Maybe you could speak a little bit, you know, more regarding that.

MR. VOGEL: Sure. The pieces that you see here are composed from new office (sic), right, so they're brought in by photography. So you're looking at reflection from ceiling. It is a matt finish. It is an orange peel. The pieces are in a diamond shape and they get put together. It's in the same family as a standing seam roof, but there's no standing seam, so the shingles actually lay into each other as they work themselves up the mansard.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Kind of like tile in a way?

MR. VOGEL: Yes, correct.

THE CHAIRPERSON: From your perspective as an architect, this is like the B -- this is the second combo or whatever, and then the other one being the first combo, which one is your choice?

MR. VOGEL: My choice would be for the darker version with the two tone. They're both residential in style, they both provide character. One is a little more formal, being more stark, more white. Here it's becoming a little more earthy in tone. It's still formal.

The brick is still going to be white. It's a subtle, right, so it's more of a texture element where you have the brick and the mortar joints, and then you have the horizontal clapboard appearance of the smooth textured cementitious siding.

MR. MCINTYRE: The Hardie siding is clapboard, but you're saying it's like a cementitious -- you know, how wide are those boards?

MR. VOGEL: They come in a range. It's probably between a five and a seven inch exposure.

MR. MCINTYRE: Okay. Again, that's something that was sort of discussed with the Planning Board initially, was that it, to sort of go in that direction, as opposed to your first choice, which was brick on everything?

MR. VOGEL: Correct, that was a recommendation from the Planning Board to tone down the white.

MS. UHLE: I don't recall anything -- and you can correct me -- I think the Planning Board just talked about the color pallet.

Because the building is in a prominent location, I think they felt that the lighter whiter starker color pallet just might be a little bit too stark, and they recommended toning it down. Unless I misunderstood, Enda, I don't think -- unless I'm wrong, Ed -- I don't think that they did discuss like HardiePlank versus brick or anything, it was more of the color pallet.

MR. VOGEL: You are correct, Margaret, it was the color pallet, toning it down. We took it a step further to change the materials.

MS. UHLE: The Planning Board didn't discuss the actual materials.

MR. VOGEL: No. We did present this as a color pallet with these materials listed here, so they were aware of this alternative.

MS. UHLE: They definitely wanted to defer to the ARB as well in terms of your opinion on all of these issues.

MR. MCINTYRE: I'm not a hundred percent convinced on, you know, the introduction of the clapboard siding. I don't see this building with clapboard siding. I

know these recesses are kind of almost sort of in the background, and they're not sort of primary prominent, I guess, columns of architecture, which are the corners and the sort of central vertical elements. What you're proposing as the deeper shade are more set back. I don't disagree with the Planning Board's comments regarding the gradations of color, I'm just not a hundred percent convinced that the introduction of a five or seven inch clapboard is the right solution here. That's, again, open for discussion. I think, you know, that -- are they overlapped like siding you would put on a home, regular siding, or do they have reveals where it's, you know, more of a stucco type reveal finish than a lap finish like you would see siding on a residential home? Edmond, do you have opinion on that?

MR. VOGEL: The intent here is for lap siding, as you would have on a home, right. There is the possibility of having reveals, right, they could be various in sizes, but that was not the intent here. The intent was to have horizontal siding.

To be quite honest with you, the client is fine with both, putting brick on the entire facade. That was the original direction. We introduced this as a second element with our client for variety and for discussion. It's fine as a full brick building as well.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I agree with you, Enda, on that. I sometimes have a problem with larger buildings that look like, you know, they're clad in home materials. They appear unsubstantial. It looks like a stick building built too high, kind of. Like a stick home built too high. Whereas brick I think gives it that more weight to it and just more of a heavier feel and just better all around. Perhaps the choice of doing a different tone could still stay, you know, with the darker in the recessed area, just slightly darker tone. I agree with you on the material change, I think maybe the brick all over would be better.

MS. NEMECEK: I agree with that too.

MR. MCINTYRE: Can you flip back to, you know, I guess the initial mood board where

we can kind of just look at one versus the other.

MR. VOGEL: This one?

MR. MCINTYRE: No. The one that was just up. So option A, I guess. Yes, that one. You had said that you had three bands, which was almost like the aggregated brick or almost like a, you know, terrazzo type brick at the base and then in the middle. So your initial sort of design was more lineal in terms of separating the three components of facade up; right?

MR. VOGEL: Correct.

MR. MCINTYRE: Now it's gone 90 degrees where now it's more vertical; right?

MR. VOGEL: What we introduced now, the base was still going to be a darker piece than the brick, then the clapboard would have been in these recesses. We still would have had the horizontal base with the body running across and the top with the introduction of an additional different material.

MR. LUCA: I think the building is going to read more vertical if, one, it's

clapboard, and also by having those two spaces in a darker color. I think you want to make this building read horizontal not vertical. That's my opinion. I think it should all be the same material and as close as possible to the -- the same color. I disagree with the different colors.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm changing my mind on that one too, Silvio. I agree that this has a better feel to it just all and all. Maybe it's just the colors.

MR. LUCA: It looks a lot more elegant, the building, this way, and it reads horizontal.

MS. NEMECEK: It's important to read horizontal.

MR. LUCA: The HardiePlank, no matter what, the smallest exposure for clapboard is 4 inches and the brick is 2 and 3/8th, so it's not going to align so it's going to automatically read vertical, the two different materials. Then you also have to trim out the windows with some kind of AZEK material and maybe a historic sill in those certain areas.

The color differentiation is going to make the building read vertical. If you look at the building, the second proposal with the darker color, it reads vertical.

MR. MCINTYRE: Exactly. It looks more bandy that way.

MR. LUCA: It's looks a lot nicer horizontal and monochromatic. I do like the metal diamond mansard roof. If anybody is familiar with Ridge Hill, a lot of the cladding on that building is very similar to that, those buildings.

MR. MCINTYRE: Right. I think your initial sort of thought process, Edmond, on this, you know, was correct. I think, as we've sort of stated, I think it certainly looks more lineal and horizontal, as Silvio mentioned. I think doing it the way which was option B, I think it kind of almost creates a little bit more of a stripy sort of vertical perspective. That's certainly my opinion.

MS. UHLE: Could I just add one comment? Again, to kind reiterate what I said previously, even though Ed is correct that

option A and option B were presented to the Planning Board, I really think they were not as focused on a lot of the issues that you're looking at because they understood that you would be looking at these issues. I really believe their only comment and concern is -- you could disagree with them on this too and I think they would be fine with that -- was potentially that the lighter pallet might be a little bit stark and to go with a slightly warmer pallet, even if it's option A. Overall kind of tone down the whiteness a little bit. Again, you could disagree with that. I think they were really just focused primarily on the color pallet. So I want you to know there may be an option C as well.

THE CHAIRPERSON: A combination?

MS. UHLE: The materials that are proposed for option A, but at a slightly warmer color. Again, it looks lovely this way as well. You're not just limited to A or B, you could have a combination with regard to the color pallet.

MR. MCINTYRE: I also think that

there's enough fenestration and movement, and, Edmund, if you could kind of give us a sort of quick idea.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Back and forth?

MR. MCINTYRE: No, not so much. I think there's enough fenestration and sort of setback in these elevations on all four sides and, you know, some of the heavy detailing with regard to the cornices and the windows and obviously the mansard, that I think, depending on the time of the day, you're going to get some nice shadowing in these recessed areas where I think visually it probably will look like, you know, you have a differentiation in terms of color purely, you know, how the light is shining and how the shadows are cast on some of these recesses.

MR. VOGEL: That's correct. The recesses vary in depth. The cornices themselves actually accentuate those pieces on the horizontal. So you would end up with some nice shadow lines as it would work across, and those shadow lines do lend themselves to the geometry that you're looking at.

MR. LUCA: The first scheme is a far better scheme, in my opinion. It's elegant, it reads horizontal more so. Also, thinking as a builder or maintenance, the two materials next to each other might be an issue down the line. The HardiePlank you don't have to paint, but at the corners where the brick and HardiePlank meet, what is that detail; what is the detail around the windows? I think those inside corners being brick and continuing across is a far better detail construction wise and maintenance wise.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I agree that it should be basically a brick building.

MR. VOGEL: As I mentioned earlier, this is where we started, and we were just listening to the Planning Board and we were just providing other options. The client is still interested in doing an all brick building.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we flip to the other one just to see the color of the roof?

MR. VOGEL: I would classify this color as a medium gray. The rendering has a

little bit of play between dark and light just to help differentiate that, as you see it. It has more of a slate-esk look instead of more of like a led or pewter type look.

THE CHAIRPERSON: In this option, would the base stone area be -- is that represented here or it's just not represented here, just the different areas?

MR. VOGEL: Correct. It's basically just the different areas. We did not put in the base stone. It was going to be similar to A and being a darker gray.

MR. LUCA: What is the dimension of those?

MR. VOGEL: They come in various sizes. They will come in the standard brick size height, and they will go up as high as 8 inches. The length will be a standard brick, and they'll go as far as 24 inches in length. The base pieces are concrete elements, full depth 4 inches, to align with the brick above.

MR. LUCA: But they're various heights or they're consistent heights? Are they all 8 inches?

MR. VOGEL: The base as we see it would all be of a consistent height as a rusticated type of base.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Can you flip back up to the other one that does include that sample.

MR. VOGEL: Sure. So the sample here is of brick, but they will cut them to size that we wish in that range of sizes that I mentioned. The sample here is showing you the coloring and texture.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So you do see it as a larger brick than what's used above?

MR. VOGEL: Correct.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Or you see it as a the same?

MR. VOGEL: We see it as different sizes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: And a similar differentiation between the color of the bottom and the top; so if you go a little darker with top color, then you're going to go a little darker with the bottom as well?

MR. VOGEL: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Can we also have a

EASTCHESTER ARB - 3/4/21

look at the cuts for the -- I think you had some lighting cuts and some other finishes.

MR. VOGEL: Yes. So this is the entry decorative fixture. It happens on either side of the doors. This is a rectangular cube, 6 by 6 and roughly 18 inches tall. The next lighting element is some area lighting. These happen over the garage entries, so they light up the entry. This has got a pyramid top to it and it's direct down light. It's mounted to the building. The last one that I have here is in the garage itself. These are the lighting within the garage. They're ceiling mounted roughly 10 by 10 in size. These aren't visible to the public. These are just internal to the garage.

Did you want to see any of those again?

MR. MCINTYRE: The railing materials, like the railings at the windows, did we see those?

MR. VOGEL: You did not. The railings here are -- let me just go to the second one. This is a version without the railings. Once

EASTCHESTER ARB - 3/4/21

we worked without the railings, we were inclined to eliminate the railings in front of the windows. I didn't mention this in the presentation earlier, is that the window sizes are generous. They're close to the floor, and then they will work their way up to close to the ceiling, so there is going to be a flood of light within the units. We preferred this version without the railings to this version with the railings.

MR. LUCA: I disagree with that.

MR. VOGEL: That's fine.

MR. MCINTYRE: Those windows/doors, do they open? Are they, you know, casement windows? How do they operate? I understand putting a sort of Romeo and Juliet balcony if the window is operable.

MR. VOGEL: The windows are operable.

MR. LUCA: But they're double hung you said; right?

MR. VOGEL: I mentioned double hung, it's the look of a double hung. They're kind of disguised here by the railings. Here you can see the way the windows are organized. So

EASTCHESTER ARB - 3/4/21

we could have transoms down at that lower piece, and then the three bays up above is what would be the operable part.

MR. LUCA: Which is a casement.

MR. VOGEL: Casement.

MR. MCINTYRE: I think it has a little bit more of a sort of richer, elegant kind of feel with the railing. I think we really need to see that kind of blown up. I see where you have it on some and you don't have it on others. I don't know, what does everybody else think?

MS. NEMECEK: I agree, I think it looks much better, except it's missing over the garage.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I think that that's a garage level, so that's probably why it wasn't put there; am I right?

MR. VOGEL: That is correct. This is a garage level, and the same on the first floor.

MR. MCINTYRE: Do you feel, Edmund it's too busy with the introduction of the railings; do you think it's just too busy?

EASTCHESTER ARB - 3/4/21

MR. VOGEL: It did make it look busy, and it's another element on the facade. We thought that peeling that back, and that was the attempt that we had before, it didn't impact our decision one way or another, and we actually in the end preferred it without the railing.

MR. LUCA: Aesthetically or financially?

MR. VOGEL: Aesthetically from us, financially from the client.

MR. LUCA: Right. But also if you do the railings, the windows would have to not be casements; right?

MR. VOGEL: They would have to be in swings.

MR. LUCA: Or a double hung.

MR. VOGEL: Or a double hung.

MR. LUCA: I think this design overall is so much more elegant, and I like the railings. Maybe the proportions or the railing would be a little bit lower, it looks like a 3 foot by 3 foot, let's say, and also, again -- oh, you might be able to change the windows to

double hung because of egress; is that an issue?

MR. VOGEL: No. The building will be fully sprinklered, we have an internal corridor, and we have two egress stairs, so we do not need emergency openings through the windows.

MR. MCINTYRE: I think if they can be in swing windows with some sort of, you know, a balcony, especially the size of the windows, I think that's certainly, you know, a bonus feature to the homeowner. I think it allows the outside in, and it allows you to sort of open up, you know, the windows. It's almost like a door opening and you have the level of protection and security that that balcony gives you. I do kind of agree that it gives it a little bit more of an elegant, kind of luxurious feel. I think it kind of enhances the overall aesthetic of the building, in my opinion. I would like to see a blown up detail of maybe a different type of railing so that it doesn't look too busy. Depending on the selection of the window, maybe you, you know,

look at a window that has more of a sort of minimalist Munton or sort of crossbar in it so that it doesn't, you know, become too busy with the window and the railings. I think it looks like that's the direction you're going in, Edmund, because the vertical components are certainly weighted more than the horizontal component of the windows. That's my two sense worth on that.

This actually reminds me of -- I don't know if anybody is familiar with driving on the LIE, but there's a residential development, I think it's a Ritz Carlton Development just off the LIE, and it's kind of got this same style of architecture kind of reminiscent of sort of a French Chateau with the mansard roofs. It's very similar to this. I certainly think this is well appointed.

MR. VOGEL: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I also think that whatever you decide to do on the windows, balcony or no balcony, railing or no railing, it should continue on to those two that over the garage, or actually technically on the

garage, just for visual sake. Not necessarily on the lower part, but on that second floor right above there it should continue across the same way. Do you know what I mean?

MR. VOGEL: Yes, I see it.

MR. MCINTYRE: Just for consistency, yes. I guess the other thing when you look at these elevations, you know, is there leaders and drain pipes and gutters? How is that being addressed as part of the --

MR. VOGEL: So the water is being collected behind the parapets of the building on the flat roof, and then these vertical wall elements are just vertical wall elements. There isn't really much of a catch area to collect water, so water is going to be brought in internally.

MR. MCINTYRE: Okay. The roof elements, the high roof elements are the stairwells and the elevator machine room?

MR. VOGEL: Right. So you see three of them up there. There are two stairs that come up and then the elevator room. The elevator room comes up to the roof surface as

an amenity for the residents. That has to push up as well, so that's why it's a little bit taller than the two stairs.

MS. NEMECEK: Will the residents have access to the green roof?

MR. VOGEL: Yes, that's the intent of the project. It's considered a recreation area.

MR. MCINTYRE: So again, maybe I missed a step, going back to option A and option B, I guess option A we're on right here, the titanium roof, like the metal roof in option A, I guess the first option that we're looking at which is the horizontal banding color, is the roof -- was it intended to be a lighter color than the secondary option which was a darker color? I think we are sort of more inclined to revert back to your original design, which is the, you know, the texture base section C, and then the lighter intermediate section, which is B, and then the mansard roof covering, which is A. In your second option, is that a darker color than what you originally proposed?

MR. VOGEL: Correct.

MR. MCINTYRE: So like how do we feel about whether it should be the titanium or should it be the kind of color slate gray?

MR. LUCA: I like the darker color.

MR. MCINTYRE: Yes, I think it looks more like natural slate.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I like the darker brick. It's not that much darker, but it's more natural looking to me than the other one. It's a darker version all around of the first option. Without the HardiePlank, I think that this pallet --

MR. MCINTYRE: But are we looking to revert back to, you know, the first option, which has got more of a textured, you know, base section?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, this has the textured base, it's just not on here.

MR. LUCA: I think just the HardiePlank and the roof color changed.

MR. VOGEL: Well, the brick color, the Hardie siding was introduced, and then the roof mansard was darker, if I was to summarize the

changes.

MR. MCINTYRE: Okay. So the morning fog, which is the textured looking brick, that's still the grade level up to, I guess, the first level above the parking; right?

MR. VOGEL: Correct. Well, that base does move upward as the terrain moves up. The base does continue, the vocabulary continues around the building.

MR. MCINTYRE: I think you just need to, I guess -- you need to kind of make that clear because there has been a difference of opinion, obviously, from, you know, some direction maybe that was shared with the Planning Board as part of the initial sort of reviews, but I kind of think this board is in agreement that we feel that, you know, simple is better than complicated.

MS. UHLE: Again, I really want to stress, I don't think the Planning Board ever asked for different materials or anything.

MR. MCINTYRE: I got it, yes.

MS. UHLE: They basically asked for option A but with a little bit darker pallet.

Even though the other option was presented to them, I think at that point they were really concentrating on other issues. What they had really initially requested was simply this color pallet be a little bit warmer or darker, which is basically what you guys are saying as well.

MR. MCINTYRE: Right.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Just so I'm clear so that they're clear as well, our collective recommendation is for the roof be darker, like the B, the brick -- now, Edmund, correct me if I'm wrong, option A is lighter than the brick on option B?

MR. VOGEL: They are both light.

THE CHAIRPERSON: They're both the same?

MR. VOGEL: No, they're not the same. They're both very light. This brick has a warmer feel to it, so it's in the warmer white, if you want to say it that way. This has a cooler white. It would then be more stark. There is a difference between the two bricks, but it is a light brick, it is a white brick.

MR. MCINTYRE: This has a little bit more texture to it, it's got some more sort of voids in it, which kind of gives it a little bit more of a --

MR. LUCA: That texture, is that an iron spot brick?

MR. VOGEL: No, it is not. It is actually a clay brick. It's more of a cream color, and then it has a coating like a frosting on top. So you start to read the depth of that cream in the pores of the surface.

MR. LUCA: Those darker specs is not a darker spec, it's just a void in a sense?

MR. VOGEL: Right. It's the texture of the brick. You're seeing the shadow within the texture. It's pronounced because the base brick is not white. On the first version, it was cast white all the way through the brick.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So we all agree that -- correct me if I'm wrong, guys -- that the roof color we like option B, the brick color we like option B, the base color I'm not seeing a difference in option B -- Edmund, is

there a difference that it would be darker as well?

MR. VOGEL: No. They are the same. As mentioned, we would then work the base to reflect the upper brick, right. We want to have the base slightly darker than the upper brick, and then the texture of that brick would be rusticated and then larger element, sort of a modular brick.

MR. MCINTYRE: Not to sort of, you know, get caught in the weeds and the minutia at this stage, but because we're talking quite a bit about what this is going to look like, the grout color in this light brick, is that going to be sort of almost the same color as the brick so it almost looks contiguous and monolithic as opposed to, you know, using a darker color? I think you want to have this almost look --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Dyed to match, kind of?

MR. MCINTYRE: Yes. What do you think, Edmund, you're the profession?

MR. VOGEL: We actually have the two

grout colors that are in here. So we had a grout color that would be for the base, and then a grout color for the brick.

MR. LUCA: How about the joint, is it raked like you show like that? That makes a big deal, you have that shadow reveal if you rake the joint.

MR. VOGEL: We were looking at a typical concave brick with a concave joint, standard stroke. If we wanted to have more of a shadow line -- the idea is to get the water in the joints, shed the water in between, therefore, we want to have a shape of a joint that allows that to happen. If we rake the joints --

MR. LUCA: Your sample board is not showing the correct joint then because that's showing a rake not a concave. You have a perfectly square --

THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't think there's any mortar in the joints here.

MR. MCINTYRE: It's just more of a brick sample.

MR. VOGEL: That is correct. All it

is is a brick sample board and these are strips of mortar joints colors, and they're just put together for color.

MR. MCINTYRE: I kind of think you want it to be as monolithic and consistent. I think just a regular brick joint where you're not necessarily looking to accentuate the brick detailing; right, Silvio? I think you kind of want to keep it as simplistic as possible.

MR. LUCA: It's really up to them. Again, being an architect, I prefer the rake joint because, again, it's going to create a shadow line and create horizontality on the building. Again, as the architect said, it might be an issue of water sitting and maintenance, what have you. I know buildings I've done in the past with the brick, I've raked the joint. It definitely gives the building a horizontal feel once it's raked, but it doesn't matter to me, honestly. I'm just giving my opinion. Also, a rake joint kind of makes the building look a little bit more, I want to say, not 2021. It kind of gives it a 1920/30 look. The overall design is kind of

going for that look, like an older building with a larger base and the mansard roof.

MR. MCINTYRE: Edmund is a smart man, he's not saying anything.

MR. VOGEL: I am quiet. I'm letting the discussion evolve. Our initial was to have colors similar to the brick itself, and then just standard concave brick joint. There are other joints that are acceptable. They're all acceptable, it's just a matter of --

MR. LUCA: I would definitely want the lower portion of the building to be raked. I think that will give it a nice look. In the larger stones, the larger pieces you're doing. That's typical to, you know, an older building as well.

THE CHAIRPERSON: It gives it a depth to that whole stone, the larger size, the deeper grooves, is that what you're saying?

MR. LUCA: Yes. If you look at some older architecture, a public library, for example, in the city, there's always, like the architect, a base, a middle, and a top or a hat. It's a vernacular of architecture. It's

architecture 101 when you design a building, you have a base, you have a middle and you have a top. Usually the base the material is more monolithic, larger, and then it scales down in the middle, like he has in his design, and then it's topped off like an icing on the cake let's say. Overall, I mean, it has all that vernacular. With the mansard roof, with the grill, with the guards on the windows, that all goes very well with the monochromatic color scheme too. I think this is a far better design. Usually the architect is always right the first time, but I'm biased.

MR. VOGEL: Right, you're biased.

MR. MCINTYRE: I would agree. I would agree. I think, you know, depending on the size of the stones that you use for the bottom section, I think that would give it more of a sort of grounding appearance, and it would make it more horizontal. I would agree with you, Silvio, I think that's a good call.

Is there anything else we need to talk about regarding the, you know, sort of architectural features?

THE CHAIRPERSON: I think that's it as far as questions that I have or comments.

Most of all the mechanical stuff is on the roof; right?

MR. VOGEL: Correct. You see the mansard here.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Can we see that roof plan again?

MR. VOGEL: Sure. So in this roof plan, as we were developing it, this green area in the front will probably be designated as the place for most of the mechanicals. The idea is to leave a portion of this open for the residents to enjoy.

THE CHAIRMAN: So only where the -- where it looks like the gridded area is, is that where they would be walking, the rest would be like non walking territory?

MR. VOGEL: We haven't fully decided all of that yet, but, yes, certainly the gridded area represents a place for hard surface and walking. The green roof we're still debating if these are going to be raised areas for plants, or if we're going to bring

the whole roof surface up so you can transition from roof to green, so from hard to soft. We haven't quite sorted all that out up here. There's going to be a lot more than what we see here happening, being that we have the mechanicals and the units down below.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MR. MCINTYRE: Other than this sort of paved area, the roof terrace, is this really going to be a usable roof area?

MR. VOGEL: We believe so.

MR. MCINTYRE: Okay. What type of an air conditioning system is being proposed; is it like a VRF system, you know, are you going to put like a cooling tower on top of this?

MR. VOGEL: We haven't gotten that far into our discussion. The intention is to have a VRF system, so we were talking about variant refrigerant flow, so that would be your standard condensers, and then you would have some form of air circulation, air fans, a unit down below within the unit.

MR. MCINTYRE: Right. There's an exhaust, so you're going to have a lot of vents

and so on and so forth.

MR. VOGEL: Yes.

MR. MCINTYRE: Yes, listen, I think if you could have some sort of recreation area, you know, on the roof that's, you know, available an accessible and people can go up and sort of experience a sort of green roof and some planting up there, again, that's just going to enhance the whole experience, and I think sort of, you know, elevate the whole project. So we would certainly look to encourage that, knowing that we have a couple of landscape architects on our board here, I think they would certainly advocate strongly for that.

MS. NEMECEK: Yes. You're still deciding between whether or not you're going to do intensive or extensive, and would you have any kind of pergola or anything on top of there?

MR. VOGEL: At this point, we do not. There are no shading devices up here at this time. Then we're also looking at, you know, extensive or intensive, what would be the

intensive roof, right. Is that just going to be a nice walkable surface, or is that just going to be more of a bed. We haven't gotten that far yet.

MR. MCINTYRE: What's the dimensions of the roof?

MR. VOGEL: It's roughly 107 feet in length from side to side, and the depth itself -- just jumped around -- is roughly --

MR. MCINTYRE: 70.

MR. VOGEL: You saw that. I was looking for it. Yes, 70 feet in depth.

MR. MCINTYRE: It's a decent footprint.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So, board members, if everyone is amenable, what I would like to -- well, first we have to open for a public hearing more than anything else. Is everyone ready for that? Are there any other questions or comments that you would like to do? We certainly have room to do that before -- I mean after as well.

MR. MCINTYRE: I think we can open it up and see if anybody has anything to say on

this.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Again, I'm just going to mention, as I did before, if you want to make a comment during the public hearing, use the raise hand feature on Zoom or star 9 if you're calling in from a phone. Margaret will acknowledge you and invite you to speak. Please un-mute your microphone and state your name and address.

So with that being said, I would like to make a motion to open Application 19-42, 5 Ray Place, for the public hearing.

MS. UHLE: Would anyone like to speak? Yes, we have somebody. Patricia, I'm going to un-mute. Patricia, can you identify yourself.

MS. GABRIELE: Hi. This is Pat Gabriele, I live at 24 Ray Place, right across from where the proposed building is. I have two questions and a comment.

The first question is -- I'm not sure if this is part of your purview -- the architect mentioned the 18 bedrooms configuration, and I noticed in the Resolution it said 18 bedrooms but 12 of them had a den;

is that something that changed from the original one or was that always the same; 18 bedrooms of which 12 had a den? We have always heard 18, 1 bedrooms and 3, two bedrooms. The Resolution that you posted just recently, Margaret, said that 12 of those 18 bedrooms had a den. I'm just curious if that's a change, and if it is a change, why it was made.

MS. UHLE: Ed, you can correct me, but somebody else had called me and asked me that, and I had at that point sort of forgotten the answer, but I do remember at the very beginning -- and Ed can probably focus in on this -- I believe the original plans had the dens as well, so they just all happen to be one bedroom. One thing that we did ensure is, that those dens are areas that actually don't meet building code standards or other requirements to be converted to bedrooms.

When the Building Inspector and I were first reviewing the application before it even proceeded to the Planning Board, we wanted to make sure that was what was being characterized as a den could not be converted to a bedroom.

Ed can probably zoom in on some of these. They're sort of labeled on the plans as sitting areas. I believe those were always proposed, and it was just a matter of the original descriptions and meeting notes, etcetera.

MS. GABRIELE: Okay. All right. Go ahead.

MS. UHLE: Ed, can you show where the den area is.

MR. VOGEL: As you look at the layout, this is the sitting area or the den area.

MS. GABRIELE: What's the dimensions?

MR. VOGEL: They're roughly 7 feet by 7 feet.

MS. GABRIELE: Okay.

MR. VOGEL: This square plus this little bit toward the front. This one here is slightly larger. The next unit is very similar to the one we just saw. This one has a sitting area.

MS. GABRIELE: That's 10 by 6 or 10 by 8?

MR. VOGEL: 10 by 6.

MS. GABRIELE: Okay. I just --

MR. VOGEL: This unit doesn't have any.

MS. UHLE: Again, they've always been proposed this way. That was just the way I think in my own meetings notes that I characterized them. At some point I started describing that sitting area as a den, as the applicant had.

MS. GABRIELE: Okay.

MR. VOGEL: Then we have here, there is none in this last one here. Those are the six, one bedroom styles.

MS. GABRIELE: My other question is, you talked about just recently shading on the roof, I'm not sure what shading means, but this building is very tall as it is, if they put some kind of shading devices on the roof, is that going to make it even taller?

MS. UHLE: If they were going to propose any kind of trellis or something like that, which they're saying they're not now, that would require Planning and ARB approval. So if they're planning to do that, they would need to illustrate that before any approvals,

and have to indicate what the impact of that would be, what the visual impact would be.

MS. GABRIELE: Okay. All right. Then a comment. I do like the idea of making it all one color. Anything that could make it more horizontal versus taller, because it is a very tall building, and I think it doesn't fit in the surroundings, but that's not place to say, so anything that could make it more horizontal, which is the darker color or one color, I am all for. That's it.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for your help and your comments, we appreciate that, and your questions allowing this to be a little bit more clear. Just so I know where you are in relationship to this, are you on the other side of Ray Place, is that where you reside?

MS. GABRIELE: Right across the Ray Place Drive. I'm in The Enclave building. Right across. When you come up Ray Place, the new building is to the left, I'm to the right. My balcony is going to be looking at this big, five story plus a bulkhead building, where now

I look at sky and I get sunlight. It's going to take away all my sunlight. I'm very disturbed about it. It's the only exposure I have, and it's going to block my sun.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Hopefully, you'll get some in between there.

MS. GABRIELE: Yes, hopefully.

THE CHAIRPERSON: It's not right up against it for sure.

MS. GABRIELE: No, but it is five stories plus. If it was a little bit lower, it would be a little bit better. I know that's not your domain.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I appreciate that.

MS. UHLE: Laura, do you want to see if anyone else has any comments?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS. UHLE: Would anyone else like to speak or have any comments or questions? Yes, okay. Let's see, try again. Did somebody else want to speak? Here we go, yes. Frank, it looks like you want to speak but your hand keeps going down.

MR. SWEENEY: Can you hear me?

MS. UHLE: There you go. Yes. Okay.

MR. SWEENEY: I have some comments and some thoughts. I'm just trying to put in perspective --

MS. UHLE: Frank, can you identify yourself, your name and address for the record. Thank you.

MR. SWEENEY: Frank Sweeney, 22 Lakeview Avenue.

I'm just trying to get a perspective of whether the ARB members are aware that -- the building looks great, to be honest, but are they aware that this building does require a significant number of variances, which I'm not sure you're really involved with?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Honestly, we're really not. That is completely the purview of the other boards, both the Planning and the Zoning Board. What we're here for tonight is really just to look at the aesthetics of the building and how beautiful or not beautiful it looks. The other parts of this application are really just not under our review tonight, but they will be under further review with the

Planning Board, and I think with the Zoning Board at this point they are done. Are they not, Margaret?

MS. UHLE: That's correct. The Zoning Board did approve the variances, and this will referred to the Planning Board to evaluate site plan issues such as storm water, sanitary sewer, that kind of thing.

MR. SWEENEY: My second item is, this is a rental property.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I believe the answer to that is yes, but I'm not going to -- Edmund, is that correct, is this a rental property?

MR. VOGEL: Correct, it would be a rental property.

MS. UHLE: One thing I would like to say too, it is being proposed as a rental property, but the Town and the boards have no legal authority with regard to the ownership of the buildings. So the board can't base a determination on whether it's a rental or a co-op or condo. That down the road could legally change without any board approvals.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Without any board

approvals from the Town, but certainly there's a whole process, if that was something they wanted to do, with the State.

MS. UHLE: With the State, yes. But I'm saying, that's not something that the Planning Board or the Zoning Board has any authority to regulate, or the Town Board.

THE CHAIRPERSON: But it is regulated.

MS. UHLE: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Very regulated. It's not like somebody could just do that willy nilly for sure. The State protects us in that way from things like that just happening without some sort of guidance and overseeing that process.

Were there any other --

MR. SWEENEY: Just two other items.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure.

MR. SWEENEY: This is so striking dissimilar to anything in the neighborhood. This is -- excuse the expression -- a white elephant. There is nothing near the capacity or looks of this building. It's so overpowering for the neighborhood. You heard

Patricia talk about her sunlight. This is going to engulf that entire hill. If you haven't walked the property by now, it is going to be a landslide piece of apartment house that I think is so overbearing, that the people in the local neighborhood, surrounding neighborhood really don't realize the power of the building you're proposing.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm not really sure, again, that we can really comment on that tonight because it's really just -- I know there are variances, but I also know that they've been granted already. At this point, it's kind of a moot point as to that.

MR. SWEENEY: Well, I think you have some authority in terms of the striking dissimilarity in terms of the architecture of the building itself, I would think that's your purview.

MS. UHLE: I think the board just spent quite a bit of time and was very careful in terms of talking about the aesthetics of the building and emphasizing the horizontality, etcetera. I think that the board as a whole,

that is how they've been spending their time at this meeting discussing the overall aesthetics of the building.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I do think that it's a beautiful building. I think it's very well done. I don't think that the object is to get everything in the neighborhood to look alike. I'm sure The Enclave -- I mean, when was that building built? I'm sure it was quite some time ago. In my mind, I know it's been there for a very long time. It's not like, you know, they're going to put something up next to it that looks just like it just to make it "fit in." I don't think that's the object of what we like to see in this Town. We do like to see some variation and some newness. This is not far ahead newness, it's just what I would think is fairly traditional in nature. It is a very, very nice building from an aesthetic point. I do believe that, and I think that the rest of the board does too. I don't want to speak for them, but just from my take on their comments and what they've said tonight at the meeting. Our goal is to not have something stick out,

but not have something be ugly just to fit in.

Any other comments from the board?

MR. SWEENEY: I just want to make clear, I'm not talking about ugly. The building looks pretty nice. I'll be honest with you, it does look pretty nice. The other thing is, it's so overbearing, and it isn't even close to anything in the north end of Town, that's what I'm saying.

MR. LUCA: That necessarily doesn't mean it's a bad thing.

MR. SWEENEY: I'm not saying bad. I never said bad.

MS. UHLE: Mr. Sweeney, do you have any other comments?

MR. SWEENEY: That's it.

MS. UHLE: Thank you. Would anyone else like to speak? Let's see. Charlie, can you un-mute yourself?

MR. GALANEK: Are we good?

MS. UHLE: Yes.

MR. GALANEK: Magic. Some day I'm going to learn how to use this.

Good evening, everyone. Good evening,

Madam Chairman and fellow members of the committee. I thank you for spending all the time with this project and other projects in Town. Thank you for your service.

First question would be, one of the members asked about rain, gutters and stuff, and the architect talked about it going into the roof and then going, I believe, internally. Can I get an explanation on how the water from the roof is going to be evacuated into a storm sewage, how that's done? Is it all within the inside of the building; there's going to be pipes going into a storm surge? Can I get an explanation on that? Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Edmund, can you explain that.

MR. VOGEL: Sure. The flat portion of the roof will collect the water. The water will be conveyed down to what we call a storm water retention system. That system is being vetted out by the Planning Board. From there it will be released into the municipal system. This is a controlled type of release. It's done over time, so it's not part of the initial

rainstorm surge.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Edmund, is it something that goes typically through the exterior walls, like some pipes down the exterior, or perhaps in the interior as well somewhere, like through the shafts of the building?

MR. VOGEL: Right. The storm water pipes would be working internally, running internally, and they will convey the water down internally into the system that is below the parking field or the upper field, lower field, wherever the location is in the base of the building.

MR. GALANEK: Are they storage tanks, and if so, what capacity are the tanks and how many tanks are there?

MS. UHLE: Charlie, this is really something that we have a civil engineer review and will be discussed at the Planning Board meeting. The storm water management system really has nothing to do with the aesthetics of the architecture. I just don't want to get too sidetracked on storm water management. As you

know, we've had that reviewed by a civil engineer, will continue to be reviewed by a civil engineer, and it will be addressed in detail at the Planning Board meeting.

MR. GALANEK: Thank you, Margaret, but since the question was arisen by one of the members, I thought it was --

MS. UHLE: I think he was asking that for aesthetic reasons.

MR. GALANEK: That's that question. Next thing, I would like the members to take a look at Enclave currently from White Plains Road. Look at the way it's setback, look at the trees that, you know, disguise it, and now look at the renderings of these new 3D pictures that you see of this new building going up with trees so high that aren't there. This is the Architectural Review Board, which I believe landscaping comes underneath your domain, and I would think that, you know, if you're going to show pictures, show a correct picture. Pull up the pictures that were shown to the board and to the public, and you'll see how tall those trees are facing the new building at 5 Ray

Place. I think it's deceiving and misleading when pictures like this are shown. Going back to what Frank had said, also when you look from White Plains Road and you look at the size of this building compared to any building in that area, it's one thing to come up and say, yes, newer buildings, newer this, but when you start to take -- my old saying is -- 10 gallons worth of stuff and try to put it in a 5 gallon hat, it's just too much for a certain area. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Charlie, for your comments.

MR. GALANEK: You're welcome.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there anyone else in the virtual audience who would like to comment about the aesthetics of this building? Margaret, you're muted.

MS. UHLE: Patricia has her hand up again. Patricia, do you want to speak?

MS. GABRIELE: Yes. I just want to know, is the developer going to come back with the renderings of the building with what you suggested with the darker color and all that?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, probably. Right now, our thought is that they will come back to us once more as they go through this process.

MS. GABRIELE: Because like Frank said, the building is not ugly at all, we're just concerned about the size of it. It's very high. I really think that you all should come by to the area and see where they're proposing this building, because right now The Enclave, you don't see it, I think as Charlie said, from White Plains. If you're looking at CVS and you look to the left, you don't see The Enclave over there, but you will see this building. It's very, very high. Yes, not everything has to be uniform in the area, but this is very, very high compared to everything else in the area. Although the building is very pretty, nobody is discounting that, it's just too big for that area. You should go up Ray Place and see where it's proposed. Okay, I'm done.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you again.

MS. UHLE: I think Frank Sweeney has one more comment as well. Frank, you'll need

to un-mute yourself.

MR. SWEENEY: Yes, I am. I'm done. I do appreciate the courtesy of the board and yourself, Margaret. Thank you.

MS. UHLE: Thank you. That appears to be it. Let me see. Yes. If you do ask the applicant -- I have one more person. Hold on. Bill, can you un-mute yourself?

MR. FIORAVANTE: Yes. Hi, Margaret. Good evening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Can you state your name and your address, please.

MR. FIORAVANTE: Bill Fioravante, 24 Ray Place.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MR. FIORAVANTE: Go ahead, Margaret, I'm sorry.

THE CHAIRPERSON: It's Laura. That's on the other side of the street, the other side of Ray?

MR. FIORAVANTE: Yes, yes, yes, yes. Real quick, I just wanted to thank you and the board for coming this evening. You guys asked a lot of questions to the architecture, which

were very relevant, a lot of different aspects, which I didn't really realize before what goes into architecture, designing a building.

One of the couple of things I did want to ask you guys, though, and I know this may be going a little bit out of the guidelines here, but does the ARB have a -- something called -- are they supposed to have something called -- do you guys have something called an architecture compliance where a new structure is consistent and conforms and is relevant to the surrounding community? So what I'm saying is, though, the architect, you know, I've seen his design many times. It's looks like something out of Pixar, like a Pixar movie. I don't know if the architect has ever been to this site to see what's going on here. It's a little bit different when you're designing something from, you know, your business or your office, but, I mean, this building here, like one of the board members said, that building, the Ritz Carlton is in Manhasset off the LIE, there's a building next door to it, assisted living, that conforms, and they both match and

they sort of conform together. Ray Place and 5 Ray Place don't match at all. I think there should be some consistency of the way the buildings look in the area. I agree, you know, when Ray Place was built it was many years ago, there's going to be some differences, but this building -- I mean, this is like looking at black and white. It is a completely different look. So I was wondering, does the ARB have a duty to keep some type of consistency throughout the neighborhood? I'm going to tell you, I did 200 signatures of people that live around here, blocks and blocks and blocks, and that should be on the record as well, and they were all against this project being built. I am going to remind you, they are taxpayers here in Eastchester as well.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We are too. Let's not forget that.

MR. FIORAVANTE: I know you guys are. I'm just saying, I'm giving you a feel of the neighborhood and how people feel about it. More importantly, what my questions goes to is shouldn't this building -- I know you guys

talked about the brick, I mean, 24 Ray Place has a dark brick. 5 Ray Place is cool, it looks like something out of Florida, very light, which is a nice look, a nice feel. Also, too, about the green roof, I think the green roofs are great, they're excellent, but having people come up on the roof, are they going to create noise? What time are those people going to be going up there until; 10, 11:00 at night?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Those are all Planning Board questions.

MR. FIORAVANTE: Okay.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Even the size of the building, again, has to do with the Zoning Board and things that have already been approved, granted and, you know, like out of our purview. I really have to restrict your questions and comments to this board to be, you know, in where we can talk about it. There are no specific guidelines, that I know of, for the ARB, or none that I was given, with regard to whether or not something needs to fit in or not. I believe there's a general statement in

what we're trying to achieve in this Town, that the ARB itself in terms of making things in the Town and new improvements in the Town look like they're not here from Mars but, you know, we're not restricted either in terms of, you know, having to make something look -- you know, making everybody in the same neighborhood use the same brick. That's not something that I think, in general, is what we're searching for either. But that's a general kind of a statement. Margaret, correct me if I'm wrong.

MS. UHLE: The Zoning Law talking about the authority of the ARB, talks about it evaluating things with regard to ensuring that something is not monotonously similar or strikingly dissimilar. It talks about general consistency with the character of the neighborhood. I think you can interpret that in a broad way in terms of, you know, the sort of design elements that are used. Again, what it talks about is not being monotonously similar or strikingly dissimilar.

MR. FIORAVANTE: Let me ask you this, if this building was being proposed on Garth

Road, I would say there would be a big difference between this building and, you know, the 20 buildings on Garth Road.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The 20 buildings on Garth Road, I know some of them are very similar to each other, but they are very dissimilar all over the place, having been built in very different decades of the last century. They also have very different looks, but that's fine, that's what brings character to the neighborhood.

MR. FIORAVANTE: I mean, when you go down Garth Road, I mean, yes, especially the buildings on the train side, you know, they look like they were built like in the Fifties, Sixties, the ones on the Bronx River look like Twenties, Thirties, but you still go down Garth Road, it still has a similar feel to it. It's like all red brick. You're going to come here, and this looks like something like a Days Inn plopped in from Orlando, Florida in this area. I'll tell you, many people, when I showed them the pictures of this, they were like, wow, that looks like a Days Inn, you know, plopped in

northern Eastchester here. My question is really going toward the facade of the building. I think if this building was more like a red brick, you know, a darker color, I think people wouldn't even notice it as much. Being that this is such a light color building in this area, it's going to stick out and not conform with the consistency of the area. I'm not disputing the green roof and the windows, I think the architect did a great job with that, and the size of the rooms and the parking and all that. Just looking at the color of this building compared to what it's going to look like to the surrounding area, it doesn't conform. Even if you look at CVS, CVS has a red brick.

THE CHAIRPERSON: And the cream color. I mean, there's a lot of difference going around in the neighborhood, which is fine, which is good. It's a good thing, in my opinion.

Just to your point about the architect not having been on the site, I am sure that in order to create this architectural plan on this

kind of a site especially, with the slope that this site has, this architect has been here more than once for sure.

MR. FIORAVANTE: Just checking.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Correct me if I'm wrong, Edmund.

MR. VOGEL: I've been to the site multiple times. We've studied the topography, we studied the site features.

THE CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that you could do without having been there, for sure.

MR. FIORAVANTE: Okay.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Especially on this site where it's not flat. It's quite a bit of work here that you're looking at.

MR. FIORAVANTE: I understand.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Anyway, are there any other questions or comments?

MR. FIORAVANTE: No. That was just my comment, my one big comment of the color of the building. I think if it was a darker color, like a brick color, it would conform more to the neighborhood. That's about it. I was just

contrasting with Garth Road or maybe even Hartsdale, East Hartsdale Avenue where a lot of the buildings there look similar.

That's about it guys. Great job, guys. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MS. UHLE: Laura, I do see we have one other person.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MS. UHLE: Dennis, did you want to say something? You need to un-mute yourself.

MR. MURRAY: Yes. Just a quick question.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Name and address, please.

MR. MURRAY: Sorry. Dennis Murray, 32 Scarsdale Avenue, Eastchester.

The previous person just said about the color of this building. I would just like to get a commentary or just an opinion from I think it was Mr. Vogel, the architect, his opinion as to whether the gray color or red -- which would be more, I guess, closer to what the surrounding buildings. Just get an opinion

from the architect as to whether red or gray is more becoming of the new building.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Edmund.

MR. VOGEL: In my opinion, the style of the building being formal and elegant and handsome, lends itself to the white and gray colors that we're proposing.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Does that answer your question?

MR. MURRAY: Yes. Considering the neighboring buildings, if that's appropriate, then I guess that's appropriate from the architect's view.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't think the goal is always for it to be, you know, a nod to the other buildings that are there already or to be, you know, a statement against them. I think it's just in and of itself, this is, you know, the building has this certain character and this character gets expressed in this color pallet in the best way, in my opinion.

MR. MURRAY: I don't dispute that. I just wanted to get the architect's -- I mean, the architect is the expert; right? I

appreciate the opinion.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Anyone else?

MS. UHLE: Let's see. Would anyone else like to make a comment? I have hands going up and down. We have some repeats. Maybe, Charlie and Pat, if you don't mind, you can consolidate your comments. This is coming back to potentially. Patricia, I'll start with you. Okay, if un-mute yourself.

MS. GABRIELE: I can't consolidate with Charlie because I don't see him. I'm in my own apartment.

MS. UHLE: I meant consolidate your own comments, so you're not coming back three or four times.

MS. GABRIELE: Well, when things come up, then it brings up a point.

MS. UHLE: That's true.

MS. GABRIELE: Dennis brought up the fact of the color, and thought I said anything that makes it look more horizontal, and a darker color is not so stark, like the Planning Board said in the building. Even though the

lighter colors maybe do go better with the style of the building, consider the people around it that have to look at it and have to stair at this big thing. Maybe darker is a little bit less right in your face. That's all. I know, we can go back and forth all the time. I won't do it again.

MS. UHLE: Okay. Thank you. Then Charlie.

MR. GALANEK: Hi. A couple of things. One, I would ask the board if they would continue to leave this open to the public on the next meeting.

Second, if the architect could make a couple renders of the project itself. In respect, you have drawings number 1 with the screened railing and also that colors; then there's the number 2, which didn't have the railing; and then what was mentioned tonight by the board. Personally, I think the railing adds to it. It takes away from that flatness of the windows. I would think the second addition to the color scheme to me aesthetically, and again, I'm not an architect,

just a local guy looking at this plan, when I look at the second drawings of the plan where it has two different colors, it almost looks like -- those five sections almost look like five individual buildings. I mean, it's stretching it a little bit, but if you look at it, there's one color, then another color, then back to the same color as the first, and then the fourth color is the same as the second, and then the fifth is the same as one and three. Then with the railing, I think that would also add a little bit more character to it. When you start looking at buildings that are almost white, they almost look like motels and hotels. I mean, we've all been on different holidays and vacations that we run across these. If you ever go to a VA building, guess what, it's sort of white.

It is a large project, it is a big building, and I would ask the board to consider asking the architect for, you know, a consideration. This way when you look at everything, perhaps maybe you might want to reconsider not going back to number 1, but

possibly number 2, or with the new version of number 3 with the railings. That's my suggestion. I thank you again. Have a good evening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Charlie, for your comments.

Margaret, is that it for tonight?

MS. UHLE: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. So we will be keeping the public meeting open. We will be asking the applicant to come back to the ARB with some small changes that we discussed this evening. Maybe zeroing in on a little more details on the facade with those options that we discussed, but of course we would like to recommend that they do go along to the Planning Board. I know this has a been a long process and they've been there quite awhile and they have other issues to work on with the Planning Board, you know, the storm water, this, that and the other thing. We don't want to hold that up.

Margaret, I just want to make sure, run it by you, because this is a little bit

bigger of a project than most of the projects that come to us.

MS. UHLE: Yes. You did that for Suez, actually, where you sort of reviewed the architectural character simultaneously with the Planning Board and the Zoning Board doing their reviews. I do think early on in the meeting especially, you were very clear with the architect with regard to your preferred options, and I could certainly coordinate my notes with him. We can go over some of them right now, if you would like. I think it would be a good idea for the applicant to come back with a new sample board showing, you know, I think it was essentially option A but with the option B color pallet, and maybe more simple railings, a little more information about rake detailing, etcetera. Also, the currently proposed -- and by currently proposed I mean what you recommended -- color pallet and materials, and then maybe some more details of dimensions and shadow lines and that kind of thing.

I think it's fine, if they're ready to

proceed to the Planning Board at the March meeting, they could do that. Otherwise, they'll be coming back to you in April under any circumstances.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Board members, are we in agreeance with that?

MR. MCINTYRE: Yes.

MR. LUCA: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Un-mute, Jennifer, please.

MS. NEMECEK: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Alrighty. So that's the status of this application. We will keep the public hearing open so that in the following presentation they can still continue to speak. The public hearing is not part of the Planning Board public hearing, they will have their own separate public hearing; correct, Margaret?

MS. UHLE: Yes, that's correct.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I would like to make a motion to extend this application on to our next meeting in March.

MS. UHLE: In April.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry, in April. But to also send it along to the Planning Board for their review for all the other options that they need to review.

MS. UHLE: Okay.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Anybody second that?

MR. LUCA: Second.

THE CHAIRPERSON: All in favor.

(AYE)

THE CHAIRPERSON: I think that's it for this evening. Thank you very much, all applicants, attendees, virtual audience members. We appreciate your input all.

I would like to make a motion to close the ARB meeting for March 4th, 2021.

MS. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRPERSON: All in favor.

(AYE)

MS. UHLE: Thank you, everybody.

MR. MCINTYRE: Thank you. Goodnight.

(Meeting adjourned.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) SS.
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER)

I, DINA M. MORGAN, Court Reporter and Notary Public within and for the County of Westchester, State of New York, do hereby certify:

That the above transcript was taken from a video of a Zoom hearing. I was not present for such hearing. The video was taken and transcribed by me to the best of my ability.

And, I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 25th day of March, 2021.

Dina M. Morgan

DINA M. MORGAN
Court Reporter

EASTCHESTER ARB - 3/4/21

CORRECTION SHEET

PAGE	CORRECTION

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER