. X

TRANSCRIPT OF

TOWN OF EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD MEETING

JUNE 25, 2020

. X

MEETING HELD VIA ZOOM

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

CHAIRMAN JAMES BONANNO
PHILIP NEMECEK, MEMBER
MARK CUNNINGHAM, MEMBER
LOUIS CAMPANA, MEMBER

EASTCHESTER EMPLOYEES IN ATTENDANCE:

MARGARET UHLE, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING
JAY KING, BUILDING INSPECTOR
ROBERT TUDISCO, DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY

TOWN OF EASTCHESTER
Building and Planning Department
OCT 09 2020
RECEIVED

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

Eastchester Town Clerk
2020 OCT 6 PM 3:05

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening. This is the town of Eastchester Planning Board meeting -- it's a video conference call -- of June 25th, 2020. We apologize for the delay getting started. The Chairman was running late. Sorry about that, guys. I'll get started here. We're going to do the roll call. The roll call is Mr. Phil Nemecek.

MR. NEMECEK: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bonanno is here. Mark Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Louis Campana.

MR. CAMPANA: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to right now approve the Planning Board meeting. So I make a motion to approve the February 27th, 2020 Planning Board minutes.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

MR. NEMECEK: That is subject to the handful of the small revisions that I provided to Margaret to forward on to Dina Morgan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Nemecek, and thank you, Dina, for putting up with Phil.

MR. NEMECEK: I'm the only one who appreciates the good work that she does, fully appreciates it by reading every word.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both. Let's see. A couple of announcements about these Planning Board meetings. In order to catch up on some of the applications, the Planning Board is going to hold a special meeting on July 21st, 2020 at 7 p.m. It will also be a Zoom meeting. A few of the applications on the agenda have been adjourned until that time, the 21st. The first is Application 19-02, 249 Main Street, the second is Application 20-08, 291 Main Street, and then 20-19, 189 -191 Brook.

That being said, there's a little bit of protocol if you're attending the Zoom meeting. If you were at the last one, you might remember. If this is new, I'll try and make it clear. We have written instructions and I'll give them to you.

First of all, if you would like to make a comment, please use the raise hand

feature on Zoom or Star 9 if you're calling in from a phone. Mr. Tudisco will acknowledge you and invite you to speak. Please un-mute your mic and state your name and address. Address your comments and/or questions to Board members only. You will be acknowledged once the Board has opened or reopened the public hearing.

That being said, we could get right into the agenda. We'll go straight to the agenda. The first application os 19-42, 5 Ray Place. So we're going to start just in general, we're trying to figure out the environmental impacts of this project. So in order to do that, we've done a number of things. We looked at the 3D presentation and right now we're looking at some traffic issues, and then we're going to look at the sanitary sewer with Mr. Cermele. So the first presentation, the first gentleman speaking tonight is Mr. Phil Grealy, who was also at the last meeting.

Mr. Grealy, would you take it away and tell us what you have there.

MR. GREALY: Good evening, Mr.

Chairman, members of the Board and public.

We had attended previous meetings and we had prepared, I guess, three previous written reviews of the traffic studies and the various plans that were presented for the application. The applicant has made resubmissions, addressed all those items. At the last meeting, there were really three or four remaining outstanding items that we felt we needed to button up in order to make the SEQRA determination. In the previous written reviews, there were certain items that we have identified that need to be part of site plan approval conditions, etcetera, so I'm not going to really get into those because we already kind of discussed all of those relative to, you know, limits of the resurfacing along Ray Place, work zone traffic control during construction.

The three items I would like to focus on, which the applicant did address after the last meeting, JMC made a submission on June 11th, we received that submission and prepared our June 19th kind of summary letter, two page

items 3, 4 and 5, which were the items that were outstanding. I'll just give a quick summary of those and where we are.

The first item was relative to the coordination with the shopping center next door in terms of the limits of the sidewalk that the applicant is building along their frontage, and also relative to some signing and striping. They have been in touch with the Highway Superintendent and will continue to coordinate those as part of the site plan approval. So I believe that condition has been addressed. Again, it ties into pedestrian and traffic interface between the 5 Ray Place site and the DeCicco's Shopping Center entrance there. So I think that's fine. They'll just continue to make those coordinations, and we'll part of that.

The second item really related to an existing condition that we asked the applicant to address, which is traffic exiting from Ray Place onto Brook Street is currently restricted in terms of sight distance looking to the left. So that would be looking left along Brook

Street there is on-street parking, and when you have a large vehicle there, vehicles exiting from Ray Place under existing conditions have trouble seeing oncoming traffic. So the applicant had previously prepared sight line diagrams which indicated the current shortfall. They have prepared in their June 11th response, some site line diagrams showing what could be done to enhance that. The enhancements would be advanced signing notification, which is typical with signing per the manual uniform traffic control devices. That would be coordinated with the County and Highway Superintendent as part of their permits. There was also an indication from the Town Board, that they may be amenable to the removal of one of those spaces. Now all of the spaces along Brook Street are metered spaces, and they would be amenable to a possible removal of one space, and to look at where, possibly, if there are other locations, to get more on-street parking. So with that said, the applicant prepared diagrams and showed that the removal of one space would significantly improve the sight

distance for vehicles exiting, so that would improve the existing condition, and they prepared a diagram indicating that. Currently, the sight distance is limited to somewhere under a hundred feet of site distance, which is not acceptable based on current standards. With the removal of one space and really looking at it from where the vehicle would be positioned exiting, that would increase to about 135 feet, a significant increase over existing conditions. So I think they demonstrated that. They went a little bit further and looked at the possibility -- again, these would all be hashed out later on -- the possibility of gaining one space along the frontage of the CVS where there is metered parking. The parking there is recessed, it's off of the travel way so that it doesn't impede sight lines. The only real issue that they did look at was relative to the loading dock for CVS is immediately adjacent to Ray Place. Based on their diagrams, it looks like one space could be -- one additional metered space could be added there and it would not impact

the sight lines. So that would end up with a net result of zero lost space. If the one space was removed looking to the left and one was gained to the right, it would be a net loss of zero metered spaces, but it would improve that existing condition. So they have gone through the whole analysis and the final details would be worked out with the Town and County since Brook Street is a County Road. They did do one step further. If that one space is gained near CVS and two parking spaces were removed west of Ray Place, there would be further enhancements to the sight distances at that location, again, increasing it to over 160 feet of sight distance. So I think they've addressed it. It's an existing condition. As part of their permits with the reconstruction of the sidewalks and their tie in's with the utilities with Westchester County, those can be finalized as a site plan approval process.

The other item, which was an issue that was raised early on, as you know, when they did their initial traffic study, the shopping center wasn't occupied, the

supermarket space was not occupied, so we had them evaluate a re-occupancy with the DeCicco's space based on the trip generation for that type of store, and they did that. They presented that back in I think their February application. We were concerned about the amount of traffic they showed, their distribution of traffic. They had more traffic going out to Route 22. So they did a subsequent analysis that looked at a higher level of traffic exiting at Ray Place, and analyzed that and showed that it would function adequately, and with the sight distance improvements would be a better operation.

The last item, there was a public comment that asked about was there a need for a traffic signal at that intersection. So we had requested that a traffic signal warrant analysis be prepared. There are standards. You can't just install a traffic signal just because you want to, so you have to satisfied these warrants. They prepared a warrant analysis that indicated that based on the projected volumes, a traffic signal would not

be warranted or necessary at that intersection. We reviewed that analysis and are in agreement with it. They looked at the various warrants. One warrant that they didn't look at in detail, we looked at the available hourly data from the County, and we agree with their conclusion that it wouldn't satisfy those warrants.

So those were the three items. They've addressed each of those. We have our recommendations of conditions. If and when they get to their site plan approval, that would be part of any approval resolution, but they've addressed everything that we've asked for up to this point in time.

MS. UHLE: Jim, you're muted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Margaret. So, Mr. Grealy, thank you very much for your summary. That was very informative. It certainly answers all my questions about what's going on there.

Gentlemen on the Board, any questions for Mr. Grealy?

MR. NEMECEK: Just out of curiosity, do we know when the DeCicco store is slated to

open? I'm certain it would be well before this application. It looks like it's getting fairly close to the point where it's going to open.

MS. UHLE: I should know the answer to that question and I don't. They were allowed to construct even during the shutdown because they're a food service establishment. So they've been moving ahead fairly quickly. I don't think it's going to be too much longer.

MR. NEMECEK: My point is simply, we're probably going to be getting actual data, albeit at a strange time. Opening a business during this particular time may not give us a true read on the amount of volume of traffic that it's going to generate once things, hopefully, return to normal. We should be getting at least some indication in the fairly near future about the increase in traffic due to the DeCicco & Sons Supermarket, which I think will have a much more substantial impact on traffic than this application, for what it's worth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next, I would like to ask Mr. Cermele to speak with us

about this application.

MR. CERMELE: Sure. Good evening. We've also reviewed several iterations of the site plan prepared by the applicant. We provided your Board with four memos, including the latest one dated June 23rd that you have before you tonight.

Similar to Mr. Grealy's experience, they've been working through with iterations of the plans addressing the majority of our comments. Many of them have been resolved completely. There are a few very minor site related details specific to sidewalks and paving limits. Some of the very minor nuances for this site, I don't see any issue or certainly any indication that they'll be addressed satisfactory when they return for site plan approval and then complete the application.

There are a few of the larger, I guess, SEQRA related items, one of which was storm water. You may recall, the applicant had proposed a certain type of system initially. We had some comment on how the off site

drainage from the DeCicco parking lot that was left to be undeveloped would impact the system. They've gone back twice now, they've rethought the system, they provided us with a preliminary storm water management plan, and we've reviewed it. We are in agreement with the system in general. We think there is -- we still do need some of the finer details with regard to the modeling and some of the interconnections and alike of the system, but I don't see that the mitigation for the storm water resulting from the development will be a negative impact. They've sized the system to mitigate through the hundred year storm event. In their analysis, they've assumed that the existing parking lot that will be redeveloped is actually -- they modeled it as a vacant site in a natural wooded condition. So a very conservative approach. They've taken what could be a best case scenario for the least amount of runoff, and applied that to a site that today is paved. So they've taken a very conservative approach at analyzing the existing conditions of the site, and then in a post

developed analysis with their development, have sized an appropriate mitigation system for the property. We'll still need to verify the soil conditions with some soil testing that will certainly come at a later date. Again, that becomes a design consideration. If by some chance infiltration is not a suitable practice there, there is enough room, I'm sure they could design a closed system and provide the same level of mitigation.

The other larger issue is the sewer and water supply. They're aware and the Board is aware they're also going to need approval from the Westchester County Health Department for extensions to both the sanitary main and water main to serve the property. Both extensions will come off of the existing mains located in Brook Street. I note in my memo that we're waiting for a capacity analysis for the existing sanitary sewer in the immediate vicinity of the project. Since this memo was issued, I've received and been able to review that study. They've satisfactorily demonstrated that, from a capacity standpoint,

the existing sanitary sewer has adequate capacity for the increased sewer load to the building.

What's been the point of discussion in the last few meetings, is more of a global look at how sanitary sewers handle in this sewer shed. The project as proposed with the number of units in it, will generate a daily sewer load of approximately 2600 gallons a day. Westchester County has a policy where they request that the municipality consider a three to one mitigation ratio for projects such as this, so that the applicant would offset the proposed sewer load in the system threefold. So we have 2600 gallons, roughly, coming off of this site once developed, which would require approximately it's almost 8,000 gallons a day in a reduction in inflow and infiltration or I & I.

We've gone back and forth a few times with the applicant and discussed some alternatives. They are proposing -- actually, step back a second. One of the alternatives was to revisit the MTA bypass that you know

very well with the Summerfield Street property. They have since sent a letter to the MTA requesting that they revisit this proposal. What this would do, it would provide a secondary means of overflow. Should the existing sanitary sewer in Harney be surcharged or overwhelmed, this would be a secondary line and provide an alternate means of bypass and flow to relieve the system and prevent or at least probably largely mitigate the surcharge that occurs today. That would be, I guess, the desired alternative for the Town and the community. Although, it's in the hands of the MTA. We don't have a response from them yet, that I'm aware of. I don't know that the applicant has heard back from them yet. If they were to come back and decline the idea or deny the ability to install that bypass, the applicant has proposed an option where they would study the existing sanitary manhole immediately downgrade from the property at the intersection of Brook Street and Ray Place and do a dry weather and wet weather flow monitoring to see what the difference is and

see what the I & I into that system at that location would be. They've also committed to televising as much as 3,000 feet of sanitary sewer, and they've allocated a certain amount of money towards repairs that the applicant would make. I think in concept it's a good idea. I think the Board needs to take a look at it and weigh that option. The only concern I have with that option is, that we're not guaranteed to find the 8,000 or 9,000 gallons a day to offset the 3,000 that the project will -- or the 2600 that the project will contribute to the system. It might be better suited that the Highway Department, the applicant, our office get together, look at the town maps, try and figure out some maybe historically known problem areas and study those areas. This particular manhole in this immediate area of the site, may not be a troubled area in the sewer system. They may do a study, they may find adequate I & I to offset the project, they may not. The way it's proposed right now, they find a study area, and there is no guarantee that we find the offset

that we're looking for for the mitigation. I think that's something that we need to discuss or the Board needs to discuss with the applicant. I don't know if they would be willing to commit to a study of the sewer shed to find an appropriate level of mitigation. It doesn't have to be immediate to the site. Anywhere in that sewer system that ultimately drains to the same point or discharges to the same point, will help offset the problem in that sewer shed.

That's really, I think, on our end, one of the last final points to get to some kind of resolution. Everything else has been largely addressed. We did see the comments from the Fire Department. I think aside from some final details on where maybe a Knox box needs to be located or the final approved location of a fire hydrant, I think -- Margaret, correct me if I'm wrong -- I think they're in a good place with this application from a fire safety standpoint.

MS. UHLE: Yes.

MR. CERMELE: I think at this point,

it's really just a matter of understanding the sewer mitigation and making sure the Board is comfortable with what's being proposed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So let me just understand it. You presented it very well. So what's being proposed is to look at the manhole at the end of the street, right, and see if there is anything that could be mitigated at that location, or just do a flow test there?

MR. CERMELE: It will be flow monitoring at the sanitary manhole at the bottom of Ray Place, which has a significant sewer area that drains through it as well. It goes across Route 22, I believe, and picks up some of the neighborhood on the east side of Route 22. It could very well be a good location to find what we're looking for. The problem is, it may also not. There's no guarantee that studying that one manhole is going to find the offset volume that we're looking for.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. So if the study is conducted and it's not found, they've done

their work or did they -- is that one study?

MR. CERMELE: That's what they're proposing right now. They're proposing to study a manhole and televise 3,000 feet of sewer pipe. We haven't defined the 3,000 feet that would be televised yet. My only concern is that we do this work -- if you were to agree to the proposal as it is, once they do this work, they've satisfied that condition, but there's no guarantee that we find the volume that we're looking for.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the whole three to one ratio wouldn't actually be put to use, we would just be studying here.

MR. CERMELE: It go either way. We could get more than we needed, we could get less. Until the study is done, we won't know.

MS. UHLE: Joe, didn't you say rather than have them do the study that they proposed, you were recommending sitting down with the Highway Superintendent and maybe have them study an area that he already knows is problematic? They've proposed this particular scenario, but if I'm understanding correctly,

to avoid what you're suggesting, Jim, that they may not find anything, maybe meet with the Highway Superintendent and Joe Cermele to discuss where we know there's problematic areas.

To be clear, especially if residents are listening, nothing has to be decided tonight. There are options for mitigation measures, and one was to hear back from the MTA. This will be at least a month or so before the Zoning Board, we have the August break, plus it will be coming back to the ARB, plus it will coming back to you. So there is time to keep evaluating this and looking into what the best option is.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. So we don't have to decide on this right now, we could wait.

MS. UHLE: No. In fact, I don't think you should. Joe's recommending sitting down with the applicant and the Highway Superintendent, who is very familiar with the sanitary sewer systems, and maybe coming up with a solution that everybody feels will work

if the MTA solution doesn't pan out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I understand now.

MR. NEMECEK: Margaret, at what point would we need to -- or who is -- who would make that decision because I understand the applicant, and I think certainly the residents from the north end who've chimed in so far, have expressed a preference to see if we could make it work with the MTA this time? I'm certainly very pleased to hear that the applicant has reached out to the MTA and has attempted to make that work. If that somehow works this time, then I think it's a win/win. But if that doesn't work, we have two options that Mr. Cermele has suggested, one of which I think somewhat poetically Joe mentioned that this Brook Street sewer at Ray might not be troublesome, which is sort of a preview of our Troublesome Brook application coming later, I would think. There's, I guess, a very real possibility that this is not a problematic area. I didn't quite understand how -- I don't think I'll bore everybody with asking you to

explain what the difference is between taking -- how the testing is actually done. I'll take it on faith that you would be able to tell if there was a problem by doing this testing. The other option that you're suggesting may be a more rewarding one, is to sit down with the people who know and identify an area that we know is problematic. If we get to that point, maybe it's best to focus our efforts on that and get a kind of a known fix. At what point does the Town come in to designating -- if MTA works, I think that's an easy one, but at what point does the Town -- who makes the decision as to whether to go on Brook Street and Ray in that sewer system or to look at something else in the sewer shed?

MS. UHLE: Two things. It's basically the Planning Board's decision. If I were you, I would defer to the expertise of our Highway Superintendent and our engineering consultant. I really trust that they would work with you to identify -- you know, you want to have the biggest benefit for the work that's done.

MR. NEMECEK: Of course.

MS. UHLE: Again, Joe, correct me if I'm wrong, even though we're saying something may not be problematic, this is still in the same sewer shed area; correct? So it would help mitigate problem areas, it may just not be one particular --

MR. CERMELE: The majority of the problem is presumed to be the result of I & I. No matter where you eliminate it, it's that much less flow that needs to go through the system. It's not going to solve all the problems, but it will mitigate the development that's being proposed.

MS. UHLE: In the same area. Joe and I were talking earlier today, it's not like they would find an area down in Chester Heights or something. It's within the same sanitary sewer shed are.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for making that clear, Margaret. That's what I was thinking. If it's down in this sewer shed area, it benefits the area, not another area.

MR. NEMECEK: We could put off making that decision as to what the preferred option

is, I would think, up until the point where we were voting on the application.

MS. UHLE: We don't know what the best alternatives are yet, but you do know that there are alternatives.

MR. NEMECEK: And that the applicant is willing.

MS. UHLE: I think it's just now taking the time to determine what the best alternative is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right, and this consideration was being addressed one way or another. The impact on the area is going to be zero because it's going to be addressed one way or another. Okay. I got it.

MS. UHLE: See if the Board has any other questions, then, otherwise, see if the applicant wants to interject.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Any more questions?

MR. CAMPANA: I have no questions. Mark?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I don't.

MR. NEMECEK: I just want to point out

that this broadcast and our sizeable at home viewing audience would probably get much higher ratings than would televising 3,000 feet of sewage flowing down, which is, I guess, what the applicant has volunteered to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: They have to hire someone to do it.

MR. NEMECEK: I know. I understand. They're looking for defects in the system.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess let's go to the applicants and see if they have anything to put forth.

MR. BOHLANDER: Can you guys hear me?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BOHLANDER: Nothing else to add. Phil and Joe summed everything up perfectly. Looking forward to working forward and just addressing the remaining comments for the sanitary and for the storm water. Nothing really else, though.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you just state your name.

MR. BOHLANDER: Rick Bohlander from JMC.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Cool. All right.

MS. UHLE: Maybe everybody is clear on this, I think what the applicant is hoping you'll do is adopt a Negative Declaration for SEQRA and then refer them to the Zoning Board so the Zoning Board can begin consideration of the area variances.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Okay. Should we talk to the public first; right? We have a public hearing.

MR. TUDISCO: The public hearing is still open, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Tudisco. Can we go to the public hearing and see if there are any questions or comments.

MR. TUDISCO: If there is anyone from the public who wishes to be heard or has a question of the Board, please use the raise your hand feature on the chat and I will permit you to un-mute yourself. I see one.

Please identify yourself and give your address.

MS. UHLE: It's muted still. Mr.

Sweeney, you'll need to un-mute yourself. Mr. Sweeney, you're still muted. I'm trying to un-mute you, but I think you need to do that.

MR. TUDISCO: He does. His hand has been withdrawn.

MS. UHLE: Maybe he's having trouble. He's back.

MR. CAMPANA: Do you hear the birds in the background?

THE CHAIRMAN: We definitely like the birds.

MR. TUDISCO: Mr. Sweeney, you can un-mute yourself if you want to make a comment. Just please identify yourself first.

MR. SWEENEY: It's Frank Sweeney, 22 Lakeview Avenue. I have a series of three questions, and I think I can vet it out pretty quickly.

Margaret, I'm just wondering whether the Planning Board members had received the photos that I sent you specifically as it relates to the Woodruff Avenue and the Scarsdale --

MS. UHLE: They did. I forwarded that

the same time you sent it to me, and I forwarded your second e-mail to them as well. So they did receive both, including the one that had the photos. The consultants did as well.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We saw the e-mail and reviewed the photos, yes.

MR. SWEENEY: I do appreciate it. Three items. During this period of time that we've been walking along this development, has the developer actually spoken to the DeCicco people to identify that some of the residents in this new development may or may not pass through their parking lot to exit out on to Route 22?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, first question. We'll answer that. What's your other question?

MR. SWEENEY: The second question is, does this whole thing fall apart if they do not get the waiver or the variances from the MTA?

THE CHAIRMAN: Keep going and then I'll try to answer them.

MR. SWEENEY: Third step would be, has the Highway Department acknowledged the fact

that we're going to take a couple of parking spaces away on the access to Ray Place as you come down the hill?

One of the most important that we haven't really touched on yet, is that the flow, where is it going to come when it comes down Ray Place onto Brook Street and it needs to get to Woodruff and Lakeview Avenue, in that sewer. You have to cross underneath the covert of the railroad tracks. Can you provide a schematic from the way it comes down the hill to the Brook Street depo, if you will, and then down into the areas of Woodruff and Lakeview Avenue, which we know right now continues to be a problem area because it's not just the piping, it's an entire infrastructure issue? We've been around this thing for many, many years, we haven't fixed it, and all of a sudden now we have another proposal in front of us and we're now looking at, how do we get it fixed. I know there's been a couple of issues where maybe an 8 inch overflow issue would help, but I'm more concerned about the immediacy of the infrastructure of the piping, and if it's going

down Woodruff Avenue, we know that for a fact, that at 700 Scarsdale Avenue on a bad day we're getting household sewage spewed onto Scarsdale Avenue. There's no surprise there. That's been happening a long, long time. This is not going to help it. I'm just trying to determine if they're going to get to the real issue of what's going to happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sweeney. Now we'll address them. What were you saying, Margaret?

MS. UHLE: I was going to say, maybe either Rick or Joe Cermele could readdress the very last question that Mr. Sweeney had, and then maybe we could go back to the other ones. We keep kind of coming back to that same question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to try, but I think Mr. Cermele could probably address it better.

MR. CERMELE: You probably all know more than me by now. So as I was explaining earlier, this project is going to produce a sewer load to the system. The requirement for

the three/one mitigation will certainly offset what this project will introduce into the system, and theoretically, two more times that. It's not going to solve all of the problems in the system. They've been long-standing issues as a result of age of the infrastructure and just development over the years. Typically, that entire burden would not be borne by this single applicant. They are providing or would be providing mitigation at a factor of safety of three, essentially. So they'll be offsetting three times what their project would introduce to the system.

The fact that a specific location on Scarsdale Avenue, you know, unfortunately seems to be the recipient of the majority of the issues, it's the lowest lying area in the sewer shed. So just by shear gravity, unfortunately, that's the spot that the problems in the system are probably experienced the most. As I said earlier, any reduction in I & I in the overall system, will certainly help that case. As I said, it's not going to eliminate it, it won't cure it, but it will certainly help, and it

will be a step in the right direction.

I don't know if that answers it for the resident?

MR. SWEENEY: Maybe start by the route or the flow from Ray Place down to Woodruff and Lakeview Avenue; how is it going to get there?

MR. CERMELE: The infrastructure is already there. It comes from Harney and Scarsdale Road, it comes up Brook Street, it continues on Route 22. So that infrastructure is already there. It's there to be connected to. They are extending that system up Ray Place with an extension to the sewer main. It will be public, publicly owned. They will have to get approval by the Health Department. It will get dedicated to the Town eventually. The sanitary sewer and manhole for the extension on Ray Place, will become Town property and the responsibility of the Town. The private service connection that will go from this new extended public main to the building, will be the maintenance and ownership by the property owner. The only change to the route is the addition of a short sewer spur up Ray Place.

All the other infrastructure would remain as is. Unless, of course, the MTA were to come back and say they agree with the bypass, then there will be an additional public main from Scarsdale Avenue underneath the MTA right-of-way, as was proposed years ago. Without that, the only change to the infrastructure would be the connection or extension up Ray Place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So, Margaret, why don't we address the question from Mr. Sweeney about the MTA variances.

MS. UHLE: They're not requesting a variance from the MTA. My understanding is, they're requesting a permit from the MTA that would allow them to do that bypass. You guys that are expert on this, correct me if I'm wrong, if they don't get the permit to do the bypass option, then there are the other mitigation options that Joe Cermele discussed previously. So the ideal scenario would be that they obtain a permit from the MTA that would allow them to do a bypass alternative. If they don't receive that, there are other

alternatives, such as Joe Cermele has discussed. So that would not kill the project.

THE CHAIRMAN: As Mr. Cermele described, if they don't get the permit from the MTA, actually the project is going to make the situation better because it's going to mitigate three times the runoff in this project. So things will actually get better.

MR. NEMECEK: I do want to qualify that because we have some responsibility working with other Town Officials to make sure we choose the best option, that we don't choose an option that's going to result in a wash, so-to-speak. If we do our jobs right, identify -- as Mr. Cermele suggested might be a good second option if the MTA option doesn't work -- if we pick a location in the sewer shed that we know to be a problematic one, that we should be able to address that in a way that, as you said so artfully, Mr. Bonanno, we should ultimately have a -- we should have a positive impact by virtue of this application being built, together with this mitigation factor, the three to one factor. If we do nothing,

we're guaranteed to get no -- if this application is not built, we're guaranteed to be in the same position. Whereas, if we require the applicant in moving forward to mitigate at this three to one ratio, we should, in theory, if done right, have a better system. The net impact should be a positive impact, not a negative impact.

I know this is an issue that we've -- at the last meeting and the meeting before that, the same issue has come up. There seems to be a reluctance to accept the possibility that the net effect could be a positive one on this sewer system.

MR. CAMPANA: Phil, I have to agree with you on that. If it stands as it does today, there's going to be no improvement. Regardless of what happens with this development, there will be betterment, which, just to be put it into simple terms, I think is a positive thing. That's all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Margaret, the one that I wrote next that I guess we could address pretty quickly is the comment about the

Highway Department.

MS. UHLE: Yes. Mr. Sweeney was asking about did the Highway Department evaluate or were they involved in the discussion with regard to removing parking spaces. I believe that was the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was.

MS. UHLE: Actually, the elimination of the parking space on Brook Street has to be approved by the Town Board. So I discussed that personally with the Town Supervisor, showed him the plans, discussed what the issues and options were. He actually felt comfortable eliminating one parking space, which I believe, according to both the applicant and Phil Grealy, will improve sight distances there. Phil, I'm not sure, were we talking about potentially adding a space on the east side on Brook Street there east of Ray Place, or would we just be eliminating one parking space?

MR. GREALY: Correct. We were looking at the possibility of adding back in a space to the east.

MS. UHLE: Initially, there was some

discussion about potentially removing three parking spaces, and the Supervisor didn't feel that the Town Board would be comfortable with that because of the need for parking for some of the businesses on Brook Street there. But by removing one space, we felt that improved the sight distance without negatively impacting parking options for other businesses, and then there's also the possibility that that space could be replaced just on the other side of Ray Place on Brook Street, so on the east side of the intersection of Ray Place and Brook Street. So, yes, the Highway Superintendent is aware of that, but that was really a Town Board decision.

I think the other question -- and the applicant can answer this, I'll just say one thing -- whether DeCicco's was contacted. I know that the property owner was contacted and notified about the application, so they have had an opportunity to comment if they chose to. They have chosen not to comment. I do know that they're aware that there is a proposal on this property. I can't say whether the

applicant actually spoke directly with anyone affiliated with DeCicco's, but I know that the owner of the property, the landlord, is at least aware of the project or should be.

THE CHAIRMAN: That kind of answers the first question about the applicant speaking with DeCicco's about residents going through his parking lot.

MS. UHLE: Rick or Anthony, I'm assuming you didn't speak directly to anyone at DeCicco's?

MR. BOHLANDER: No, we have not. Not directly with anybody at DeCicco's.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nor would I expect you about this in particular. It's a comment, and I think at this point it's speculation as to how the traffic is going to flow.

MR. GREALY: Mr. Chairman, Phil Grealy. Just one item. As part of the traffic study, just to point out that the development across the street, the Enclave, there already is use of the shopping center by some traffic. Whether they're just going there to shop or they're going out to 22, the traffic volumes

leaving Enclave and coming into Enclave show that traffic does come through the shopping center. So I would expect that this would be a similar situation. Again, they agreed to discuss the whole coordination with the shopping center when they get to the next step.

THE CHAIRMAN: They have. Well, that's encouraging. So your traffic modeling includes traffic going in that direction?

MR. GREALY: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: So then it's been addressed or it will continue to be addressed. Okay. Great. Mr. Sweeney.

MR. SWEENEY: Just one remaining question. From the flow standpoint, as I understand it, it's coming down Ray Place to Brook Street, down Brook Street to Scarsdale Avenue, if you will. The only thing is that intersection of Woodruff and Lakeview Avenue, a spur is not going to be able to handle the flow. It doesn't handle it now, so we should be upfront that somewhere along the line that infrastructure, either the pipeline or the sewer itself, is probably going to have to be

reworked so at least it's a reasonable solution for everybody that's involved. I don't know how big a job that is, but basically we discussed this over a number of years, maybe it's a Town responsibility, I don't know, but the idea is that you just can't put a spur in there and hope that it's going to handle the Ray Place issue. It's a lot more than that right now at this point, in my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. I think we've addressed your questions, Mr. Sweeney. Thank you for bringing them forth.

Anybody else in the public?

MR. TUDISCO: Mr. Chairman, I don't see any other members of the public. I will note it appears that Mr. Sweeney's hand is still raised. I don't know if he didn't turn that feature off or --

MS. UHLE: He just did, and he muted himself. I think Mr. Sweeney is done, and I don't see anybody else with comments at this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. All right, guys, so this is back to us. Now is the

part that we've been working on, and that is if we believe that we should adopt a Negative Declaration. I think everything has been presented to us, and I'm convinced that the impact of this project has been looked at, and I don't think there will be any impact such that we can't vote on that. Gentlemen, I guess we could vote or would you like to make --

MR. NEMECEK: I wanted to simply make a comment that in my view, the biggest issue with the impact is with respect to the massing, but I'm satisfied that based on the 3D rendering that we looked at at the last meeting and the fact that it does seem to be a very well conceived project, that I'm comfortable enough moving forward with a Negative Declaration.

MS. UHLE: I also just want to clarify something. For speaker purposes, the threshold is that there will not be a significant adverse environmental impact. So there will be impacts and there may be some that are not significant or there may be some that are beneficial, but this is the threshold for significant adverse

environmental impacts. For the concerns that you have, it seems like the applicant has demonstrated that they can mitigate the potential impacts so that they will not be significant.

MR. NEMECEK: Correct. One further point is, I know we're all very aware that the DeCicco & Sons supermarket will be opening fairly soon, and that will have a very profound impact on the use of that property, including the Ray Place property, but that's going to happen with or without this application. I don't think it's appropriate to charge this application with what is going to happen irrespective of our decision on this application. So mindful of Margaret's reminder that it is a significant negative impact that we are looking to evaluate here, not any impact, again, having listened and analyzed, read through the papers, heard from the public, heard from the applicant, heard from our consultants, I'm quite satisfied with adopting a Neg Dec.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that being said, I

make a motion to adopt a Negative Declaration for the SEQRA review of Application 19-42, and refer the application to the ZBA for the consideration of the area variances.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. That's good news. The public hearing is open and it's going to remain open until your application comes back to us. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

MR. BOHLANDER: Thank you guys very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Have a good evening.

The next application is 20-13, Troublesome Brook Pumping Station at 10 Leewood Drive.

MS. UHLE: Give me a minute to set people up here. Do I have everyone? They're coming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, the whole team is there?

MS. UHLE: Yes. Lino, can you see if I'm missing anyone? I think I have everyone.

MR. SCIARETTA: I think you do, Margaret. Steve, Joe. I think we have everyone.

MS. UHLE: I do have a call-in user that's not identified. That may be Vince. Did he want to participate as well or is he listening in? I'm not sure who this is because it's not identifying who it is.

MR. SCIARETTA: I believe Vince was calling in.

MS. UHLE: Okay, so we'll see.

MR. SCIARETTA: Hopefully it's Vince.

MS. UHLE: It's not allowing me to promote him. Vince, are you there?

MR. FERRANDINO: Yes, I'm here.

MS. UHLE: Okay, there you go. Now you're all set. Everyone is here.

MR. FERRANDINO: Yes, I am, I'm here.

MS. UHLE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: So if I may, I think, as the applicant probably knows, the reason we're here is to try to do the same thing we

did on the last project, see how we feel about the adverse effect on the environment, and then, if possible, vote on that and move you forward to the ZBA. Right now I think the format we're going to do is the same as the last one. We're going to first listen to our consultants, and then we'll go back to you guys. So first is Mr. Grealy.

MR. GREALY: Hello, again. Philip Grealy, Mazur Consulting. We have received the latest submission from the applicant. That included a June 5th summary letter from Ferrandino & Associates. That letter addressed each and every one of the comments that were presented in our May review and discussed at the last board meeting.

In terms of traffic conditions after the completion of the project, everything has been addressed. They've indicated the delivery paths of the salt truck and how that can be accommodated. The only item relative to that, and they seem to be agreeable, which would be a site plan approval condition, is that the route of the salt truck leaving the site requires it

to continue down Columbus Avenue, down Dale into Columbus in a section that's somewhat constrained, and they've agreed to coordinate so that those deliveries would not occur during peak hours when there are higher volumes traveling to and from the train station. Again, that's just a condition of approval, and there are several others like that relative to required resurfacing of pavement and related items that we don't need to get into that are outlined there and would be conditions of site plan approval.

As discussed at the last meeting, the most significant items, and there have many clarifications made by the applicant, are the potential impacts during construction. We have a 22 month construction period, and the applicant has done a nice job of now clarifying certain items and laying out a schedule and what types of activities that could affect traffic flow and how that would be handled. The majority of those conditions are pretty standard in terms of construction projects and would not have a major impact on traffic flow

in the area. They have identified a series of several times during the construction period, I think it's a total of about 5 times, a total of maybe 16 days over that 22 month period where they would potentially have to close all the eastbound flow on Leewood Drive, and that would require a rerouting or a temporary detour. During that time period, they have agreed to use police control and other measures, which, again, these would all be hashed out and made conditions of approval. In terms of to mitigate that condition, they've agreed to a series of measures.

The one item that I think is of significance is relative to the detour routing during those closures. Again, it's a total of 16 days, and that would be something that they would have to commit to so that we don't have an extended period of lane closures on Leewood Drive. In the original application, they had shown the closure to occur with a detour of traffic eastbound, so this would be coming from the parkway direction coming through the tunnel, and/or from Dale Road that would want

to make a right turn onto Leewood Drive. That traffic would be detoured because there would be no eastbound traffic basically east of the Dale Road intersection. So under that condition, the traffic eastbound would be forced to make a right turn if they were coming through the tunnel, and they would be forced to be intercepted, if they were heading north on Columbus on to Dale, intercepted beforehand and rerouted. The original plan had called for the use of Crosshill, so you would leave Dale to Crosshill to Oakland, make a left on Oakland, and then back over to Leewood Drive. We had pointed out that the ability to turn on to Crosshill from Dale is currently restricted because it's do not enter one way signs, and it's only at that intersection. So the applicant has now indicated an alternate path, which would be to route that traffic down to Benedict. Now, Benedict Avenue is the next parallel street to Crosshill. So if you're looking from north to south, the east/west roadways are Leewood Drive, then Crosshill, and then Benedict, and then Oakland runs

north/south parallel to Dale. So their current plan suggests possibly using Benedict because Benedict is a two way road currently, and Oakland is, of course, a two way road currently.

Now, our initial comment was to discuss with the Town Board and get some input about the temporary detour to use Crosshill because if Crosshill was used to get to Oakland for these temporary time periods, it would be fewer homes that would have to be passed by this additional traffic than if that traffic was rerouted to Benedict because now they would have to go up Benedict and they would have to pass probably another 20 homes on Oakland before they would get back up to Leewood Drive. So again, this is a temporary condition. They've identified the times that it would occur and the number of days that it would occur. So I think they've done a good job in nailing that down. I think that would be a condition of approval, that those would be the time periods we're talking about. They would use police control and flag men and other

controls, which would be detailed in a work zone traffic control plan that would be reviewed by us, the Highway Department, the Police Department, Fire, and also Westchester County.

So I think from a processing standpoint -- and again, this can be worked out in the site plan approval process -- but our recommendation would be to either look at Leewood Drive possibly being widened on a temporary basis, which may not be feasible but they haven't shown that. There are restrictions that there are utility poles on the north side of Leewood Drive, there are existing trees, etcetera, so for the limited number of days that they're talking about having this detour, it may not be feasible, but we would like to at least see that to show that they explored that possibility. Again, I don't think anything very detailed, but it could be hashed out in the site plan approval process.

The second best scenario I think would be to talk to the Town Board about a temporary detour that would lift the do not enter at the

end of Crosshill and Dale and use that as the rerouting plan during this time period, and that the last resort would be to have traffic travel all the way down to Benedict and then back up Oakland, because now you're increasing the number of residents that you would be passing on both Dale, Benedict and Oakland Avenue. So I think that's probably the most significant item that would have to be hashed out.

We also had some items relative to parking. The applicant has indicated the number of construction workers that would be there, and that they would make arrangements for either car pooling or other offsite locations so that construction workers would not park in the immediate neighborhood. So I think that's fine. I believe the Town should just be made aware of whatever those arrangements are, and that they should just continue to work towards these resolutions of how traffic would be handled during this construction period.

So I think that's kind of a summary of

where we are. The applicant responded to each comment we had in our previous 12 page review, and we've reviewed all of those. Most of them, as I said, would have to be conditions of site plan approval, but it's really just this during construction time period that needs to be dealt with. Of course, they would have to also address any of the outstanding comments with the Fire Department, etcetera. I think that's where we are right now. All the other items, they've addressed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Grealy. Questions from the Board first before we move on here. I had one because I read some of the reports. I'm just trying to understand -- I guess I could ask the applicant also -- I'm trying to understand the size of the trucks that would be coming and delivering the salt. I think it was designated -- I could be wrong -- HB40; is that what it is? What does that equate to?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: I forgot the designation. I think it's a WB40.

THE CHAIRMAN: WB40. Okay, got it.

What is that equivalent to? A truck that we would know. I'm thinking it's an 18 wheeler coming down.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: No, no, it's not. John Telesco is on the phone, he probably sees them regularly. I don't know if you know a good equation of a truck to that.

MR. TELESCO: It's a tractor trailer. It's similar to a water tank truck.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes, water tank. That's a good comparison.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. It's not an 18 wheel type truck that you see on the highways.

MR. GREALY: It's the smallest of the tractor trailer type vehicle. So the WB designation is the wheel base. They go up to as much as WB67, which are the large tractor trailers that you would see on the highway. This is the smaller, but it is a tractor -- you know, a tractor cab type unit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does 40 indicate the trailer length behind it or --

MR. GREALY: Wheel base. They've demonstrated the turning tracks. One of the

things -- just to close on that -- we were concerned about the ability to make that turn from Columbus onto Fisher because that's the route that they would leave, and they demonstrated that that turning track can be accommodated in the existing intersection in the pavement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. NEMECEK: I have a question. I may simply have missed something in the application or maybe even in some of the presentation. As I understand it, the need for the extended driveway, for example, and all of this discussion about wheel base and the traffic flow emanates from the fact that we're using a truck of this size to make deliveries I think once every two months. Is it feasible at all, is there something prohibiting deliveries on a more frequent basis in a smaller vehicle that might require less disruption of the site, such as leaving the driveway the way it is in some form or another, effectively the way it is right now, instead of having it have to come out onto Dale Road?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: So the reason for the driveway configuration is really just for that salt truck because of its size. Trying to turn that around on our property would not be feasible. As far as other truck sizes, these trucks are a bit specialized in that the way the salt gets delivered is that it's actually blown into the tanks. The trucks are fitted with compressors and alike to make that happen, so they are a bit specialized. I don't know if they offer other truck sizes as far as that goes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I have two questions for you. One is, is there some way that we could have a picture of the size of the truck actually instead of just giving it to us with a number so we could actually see it?

Also, just to elaborate on what Phil said, which was, has there been any talk about going around the building with a driveway so it goes back out onto Leewood? I mean, you're basically taking the whole lot at this point. The whole property that borders up to Dale Road at this point basically is not even being used.

In the illustration that you showed, it showed that kind of landscaping and everything over there. If the building is sitting in the middle of the property and you enter the driveway as it is now and the driveway goes around the building, it goes back out on Leewood.

Coming out onto Dale Road is a really bad spot. You said you've done traffic controls and surveys and everything, but I happen to live on the block, so I know what it's like at 6:00 in the morning to try to make the turn onto the Bronx River Parkway, and that continues all day. It's an incredibly busy intersection. It's a congested intersection. Bringing that driveway onto there is just really not a good idea.

MR. NEMECEK: I would like, by the way, Mr. Bongiovanni, or whoever on the team, you said that you're not sure whether there is another size truck. I would like you to find that out for me, for this Board. If there is a smaller truck that somehow lessens the impact and works, certainly we would want to consider

that. If there is no other plausible truck, fine, we just need to know that. Okay?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Just to make one comment, though, about that. Smaller trucks will be more deliveries, which will be more traffic. Right now, the estimate is this is happening six times a year.

MR. NEMECEK: Yes.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Just to reiterate that.

MR. NEMECEK: But if you get a truck half the size, it will happen 12 times a year, in theory. Once a month. But you're not having the same -- perhaps you're not even touching Dale Road.

THE CHAIRMAN: So can I circle back here? So Margaret, the intent was to talk to Mr. Grealy, and then talk to Mr. Cermele, and then go back to the applicant and discuss issues such as this, and we've started now so we certainly can continue. I guess the bigger question is, Margaret, these issues that we're bringing up now, are these issues that are site plan issues that will be reviewed later on when

the project comes back to us?

MS. UHLE: That's really up to you. I would still consider these site plan issues again because it sounds like -- unless you think that by not understanding the size of the truck, that could result in a significant adverse environmental impact, it sounds like you still have some options with truck sizes, with the driveway alignment, that kind of thing. Ultimately, it's up to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good enough. Gentlemen, we'll come back to this and continue speaking with the applicant about these issues. I think they're significant, I think they're important, and we should discuss them.

So let's let Mr. Grealy go, thank you, and ask Mr. Cermele to present on this project.

MR. CERMELE: Sure. Thank you. We had seen two iterations of the plan, provided memos on both, and a third one more recently in response to Jacobs Engineering's June 5th memo responding to our second memo prior to this.

Basically, at this point, everything regarding the site with regard to erosion

control and layout and some of the site elements, fencing and whatnot, have really been addressed. There are some very minor outstanding items to deal with. Some of the details and nuances with utility clearances, resurfacing on Dale and/or Leewood, as Mr. Grealy had already discussed, and certainly some of the traffic issues that he just finished speaking about.

From the site engineering and civil engineering aspect, I think we're at a very good point with the plan. They provided a storm water mitigation system to mitigate peak rates of runoff from the site or generated by the site through the hundred year storm event, so we are satisfied with the mitigation system they proposed. As far as our memos go and our latest memo, I think any smaller or remaining items could easily be addressed during site plan approval or a condition of site plan approval should it get to that point.

I did note in my memo that there were some comments from the Fire Department. If you would like, I could just go through some of the

comments briefly. I don't want to speak for them, but I could try to just elaborate on some of their concerns and some of the discussion they've been having with the applicant.

We were just talking about turning analysis for trucks. The Fire Department had also requested a similar analysis for their fire apparatus. I understand that they recently provided the applicant with the geometry of that apparatus, so they'll be providing a turning analysis for the Fire Department's review, just to ensure that they can safely navigate through the site in the case of an emergency. That will be forthcoming.

There is discrepancy in their interpretation of the Building Code both by the applicant and the Fire Department. It seems the applicant is under the understanding that the building will be classified as a Type U building, where the Fire Department would consider a -- it's a Group H4, high hazard building. I'm not familiar enough with the Building Code to discuss the nuances between

the two uses, but what's important here is based on the use group, it would dictate the need or not for a monitored fire alarm system and automatic fire detection. The high hazard group would require that, it's my understanding, and U group classification would not. So still some discussion has to be had between the Fire Department and the applicant and come to a conclusion on what the use classification for the building would be.

They have also requested or recommended that the Town look to a third party consultant to review the plan and the building as it relates to the chemical storage, the sodium hypochlorite storage, and the operation of the building itself. They did note that the existing facility on California Road does provide the Fire Department with hazardous -- they did provide them with a hazardous material management plan and an inventory statement annually, and the MSDS for the sodium hypochlorite solution that they're using there as well. So they were expecting to see the same level of, I guess, material management at

this site. I don't want to speak for Jacobs or the Fire Department, but it seems there is still some information to come to satisfy the Fire Department's concerns with the use of the building, the expected manpower for the building, or lack of manpower I guess, and the chemicals and the storage of the chemicals in the building.

Then there was a final minor comment regarding some signage that I'm sure would be addressed before site plan approval.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Just one question about what you said. Is a monitored fire alarm required for the -- does monitored mean with personnel on site or just with some sort of signal that goes off somewhere else?

MR. CERMELE: I believe, and I'm not a hundred percent certain, I don't know, maybe the applicant's architect could speak better to it, I would imagine it's a fire detection system, heat detectors, smoke detectors, or a combination thereof. Rather than have a central alarm, it would send a signal out to the owner, the Fire Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. UHLE: Could I just say something very quickly about that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course.

MS. UHLE: Actually, this happens fairly often with either the Fire Department or the Building Inspector here where there are some different interpretations of the code in terms of the classification of a building. I know that the Fire Captain submitted his memo on the 19th, and since that time, the applicant has reached out to the Fire Captain. I think they're discussing -- I think it's just going to boil down to an agreement between how this building is classified, and then they'll have to do what they have to do, or the Fire Captain will say, you know, I understand their interpretation now. I just wanted to say, that's fairly common where there are some interpretation issues where there has to be some further discussion between either the Building Inspector or the Fire Captain.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Margaret. Any more comments from the Board or questions for

Mr. Cermele or Mr. Grealy?

MR. CAMPANA: I have none.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do this, I just wanted to point out that our concerns of the Board are threefold here. One was the traffic concerns, which Mr. Grealy has addressed. The second are the concerns that Mr. Cermele has addressed regarding the civil issues. The third is, of course, one that we haven't really discussed yet, and that is about the visual and architecture of the building. I know at the last meeting, we had some comments about that. I gave a few to Margaret and Margaret told the architect about massing and about what we would like to see. I think what's been decided is that before we start making too many comments, that the applicants meet with the ARB and they're going to have a look at the project on July 7th to give more specific direction, and they're going to continue to meet with them as they meet with the ZBA to circle in on a design that the ARB likes. Everything that we've said previously has been forwarded to the ARB. Rather than start critiquing the architecture

and the size of the project right now, we're going to let the ARB do that, and then they come back, we'll see what they have, and continue from there. That being said, that's the last concern that we had.

I think the next thing is to talk more about the site plan, as we were doing, and figure out how we go about addressing those issues. So if we go back to the applicant, if they have anything that they were going to put forth to the Board tonight, please do so. If not, we'll just continue putting forth questions.

MR. SCIARETTA: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, and just to reiterate, thank you for the reports that were given. Again, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, my name is Lino Sciaretta from Montalbano, Condon and Frank.

With respect to the architecture, yes, we are scheduled to go before the ARB, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, so we will be going there to discuss the visual.

With respect to the Fire District, that's an ongoing dialogue, as Margaret had

mentioned, so we have been in contact and we will continue that dialogue.

With respect to the trucks and the alternate regarding Benedict and Crosshill, if it's okay just briefly to turn this over to Steve Maffia from Ferrandino Associates just to address quickly those points.

MR. MAFFIA: Thank you, Lino. Steve Maffia. Regarding the salt truck delivery -- I'm going to try to do a screen share. This is a diagram from ASHTO, the America Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, just to give you a sense of the profile of the WD40 truck. It shows you the dimensions and feed of the cab and the dimensions of the trailer part, a little over 25 feet. It's a semi tractor trailer. The truck that would deliver the salt, wouldn't have this same box type configuration. It would be more of a tanker style truck with the pump on it that delivers the salt to the site. Essentially when we're talking about the wheel base of the truck -- I don't know if I could show it -- a little bit farther down, we can see the turning

radius of that truck. This is basically what Jacobs Engineering used to show that the turning radius of this type of truck could fit through the site, down Columbus Avenue, and on to Fisher.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MAFFIA: That salt deliver truck, again, is, we feel, an insignificant number in terms of the -- we had just talked about it -- six deliveries a year or one every two months. We'll look into a different type of truck, a smaller truck and more deliveries, but we don't want to get into a situation where there's weekly or even monthly deliveries. I think the way the pump station operates, it's best suited to get a salt delivery every 60 days or so. That's the operational parameters that they usually work with.

As far as parking is concerned, Dr. Grealy had mentioned in his opening statements about not parking in the street. This, along with a number of other things that were in his latest memo, are conditions that Suez is amenable to having added as conditions of

approval. That would include not parking on any -- not have any of the contracted workers' vehicles parked on any of the neighborhood streets. We would consult with the Town, we would let them know where we're finding offsite parking remote from the site. We would use a car pool situation or some kind of transport of the workers back and forth from that offsite location to the worksite. So we're amenable, again, to that as a condition of approval, no parking on the local streets.

As far as the salt delivery is concerned, not only would we limit the deliveries to off peak times so that the salt truck isn't out on the roadway trying to turn in and out of the site during the peak hours, we would also coordinate when that happens with the Police Department so that the Police are aware of the fact that we are having a salt truck delivery, that it's happening within a certain time frame, and that it's entering from Leewood Drive and exiting onto Dale, which had been the established route that it would work from the turning radius standpoint. If there

are concerns in the area that Dr. Grealy had mentioned where Dale turns into Columbus and sort of narrows down to about 20 feet, we would allay their concerns, if they have any, and let them know that whenever the truck is done, that it's on the move, and it will be expected to pass by the Police Department that would be on the scene.

As far as the detours are concerned, Dr. Grealy had mentioned -- and this, again, would be a condition of approval -- that the detours would be significantly limited in terms of not only the event itself but the duration. We expect that the detour of eastbound traffic coming out of the tunnel or turning right from Dale, would occur on five separate occasions, not consecutive days. The longest number of days that the detour would be in effect would be about four days on five different occasions, and again, not consecutively. The entire construction time frame is 22 months or over 600 days, so we're talking about 16 days out of the 600 or so days that we would have an eastbound detour. Westbound traffic on Leewood

going towards the tunnel towards the tracks and the parkway would not be detoured at all during any time of approved construction. The route of the detour because of the one way situation or the do not enter situation at Crosshill, we are opting for Benedict simply because it's already two ways, it's parallel to Crosshill. It's a little bit farther, a little bit longer detour, but we counted the number of houses, and there would be additional 23 homes that would be passed by any vehicle being detoured. However, detours will only be done during off peak times, and again, during the day. So no peak hour traffic during the morning or in the evening would be part of that detour. A detour would be established and set up after the morning rush hour is over and would run during the midday period and end before the PM rush hour begins. So only non-peak traffic would be detoured in the eastbound direction from the Dale Road intersection to Benedict and Oakland back to Leewood.

We did look into an alternative to widen Leewood Drive to try to keep the two

lanes open. I'm sharing again on my screen a shot of Leewood Drive looking towards the one lane tunnel and the railroad tracks, and you could see along the right side of the roadway where the curb line is, utility poles right up behind the curbing and a beautiful stand of evergreen trees that are part of the front of the golf club. This is directly across from the site, as you could see in the picture. So widening in this area in order to maintain two lanes would be not only expensive, but it would be pretty devastating on the landscaping in front of the golf course, and we wouldn't want to go there. We're not exactly sure where the property line is, but if there is some widening that is significant and utility poles have to be relocated, we may be getting into also right-of-way issues where we would end up trying to relocate utility poles on the golf course property. So we did look at the potential of a widening in order to maintain two lanes at all times, but that, combined with the fact that we're looking at no more than 16 days out of the 600 and some odd days of

construction work, that the detour is the better way, the less onerous way to go with less impact on the roadway and the neighboring properties.

Okay, I think that's all I have to offer at this point in response to Dr. Grealy and members of the Board. Thank you.

MR. SCIARETTA: Thank you, Steven. Mr. Chairman, just real quickly regarding Mr. Cermele's memo, just Joe Bongiovanni if you could just speak briefly to that.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes. Obviously, we provided our responses to Kellard Sessions' letter and Mr. Cermele has gone through it with the comments. We basically concur with everything. We have no issues with any of the comments. So that's one item.

I just have one other item I would just like to add about the -- we're talking about the site plan and Dale Road access, the driveway off of our property onto Dale Road. As part of the Fire Department's review letter, they were asking about turning radiuses. We did get the fire truck apparatus dimensions.

It's a very similar wheel base to the WD40. I think it's a little bit wider vehicle. We did put that into our turning radius analysis, we have that done, but it does use Dale Road to leave the site for a similar reason. Trying to make that vehicle turn around on our site would be difficult. That's how our turning radius shows the path of the fire truck. I just wanted to mention that as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the fire truck heads south on Dale?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: That's how we show it leaving the site as the easiest means to make a turn, as opposed to a right turn back on to Dale.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a question, and maybe Mr. Maffia could just address it because I don't remember hearing it, and that is, when the truck goes down Dale, when it gets to the neck down part you said the Police Department would be notified that the truck was in route or you could suggest that? Am I misinterpreting what you said?

MR. MAFFIA: The question was as far

as scheduling the salt delivery trucks. First of all, keeping them on a schedule that doesn't put them out there during the rush hours, the morning and afternoon peak hours, so as not to interfere with significant activities at Dale Road where, as Mr. Cunningham pointed out it's a busy intersection, and as Dr. Grealy pointed out by the train station. So we want to put that particular truck, as infrequently as it does occur, expect it to occur outside of the peak hours. We would go one step further if the Town wanted to make it a condition, that we would also notify the Police Department of the scheduling of that truck so if they want to be on hand when the truck is leaving the site, they can do so if they want to. If they want to be at that point if they have to direct traffic. We don't believe that that's necessary, but we're offering that --

THE CHAIRMAN: You're offering that. I see.

MR. MAFFIA: -- To give a degree or level of confidence that it addresses the concerns that Dr. Grealy had pointed out and

that the Chairman just did about the necking down.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's just an interesting point. That's Tuckahoe.

MR. NEMECEK: The road necks down at Tuckahoe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. The police are usually on the other side trying to stop speeders. Okay, so I understand.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's Crosshill for Eastchester and at that spot for Tuckahoe.

THE CHAIRMAN: At least I understand it. Thank you.

I guess we're going back to plan issues. I don't remember, and maybe I wasn't paying attention because it was getting late, when we were looking at this application last time, talking about trucks coming in, trucks coming out. I know you guys showed us the presentation, we looked at it, and we moved on. Were we ever shown a site plan that showed a truck on it? I don't think so.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I never really saw a drawing of the building and the proximity of

all of the property as it's going to be when it's down. We saw renderings of it, but they were really not correct.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: We have, as part of the application package, the Planning Board drawings, there was a turning radius drawing in that set.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: What we're looking for is an actual -- here's the size of the property, here's the dimensions of the property, here's the building sitting on it, and show it to us in that respect. That's what I would like to see.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: That was part of presentation last month, the site plan. It was one of the drawings we did bring up. I have it. I could show you.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'll look through the package and see if I could find it. We'll review it from that.

MS. UHLE: Joseph, do you have it available to share the screen now?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, bring it up. I would like to see it.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes, I can. I'll share my screen. You can see this now?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: I'll try and zoom in a bit. So we have our access off Leewood. This is the main driveway. The building sits towards the back of the property line here. We have the driveway going out to Dale. This does not show any of the landscape or anything like that, so it's just site features. There's a fence that will go all the way around it. We have a gate at Dale. One of the nice things about this is, we're able to pull our operator into this driveway. The operator visits once a day, you know, for an hour or so. So the one nice thing about this, you could pull in off the off the road and be able to access the gate as needed, as opposed to on this where the fencing is closer to the property line, we don't have that luxury. So that was the one of the other reasons.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There's 72 feet from the eastern side of the building out to Oakland Avenue?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: That is correct, yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I can't see the figure on that, but there's 25 feet in the back?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: There's 25 feet in the back, yes, that's correct. This does span three parcels. This is the township property that we're looking for an easement on. The building is situated on Suez property. We don't have any above ground structures on township property. It's mostly pipe and driveway at this point.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: All of the excavation that has to be done out on Leewood Drive, is all your piping that's coming into the facility now?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: That's correct.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: So that's just old piping that's going to be changed out or different sizes added in or whatever to upgrade the system?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: A little bit of everything, yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: So just a question, and forgive me if it's not very educated, but is there any way to get the truck when it comes out on Dale to swing back and go up Leewood, or it just can't make that turn, it's too tight?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Not without, like someone mentioned, going around back, but I just don't --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It would have to go back around and come out at the same time because it's so tight there.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes, it's pretty tight.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: A small truck could turn out and go right onto it because there's an island also. There's an island in the middle of Dale. There's two lanes of traffic when you come on to Dale. There's one lane tight when you come through the tunnel when you make the right-hand turn, and then there's actually two lanes that comes off from Leewood. If you're coming down Leewood towards the tunnel, you could turn on to Dale.

MR. CAMPANA: What's the count on that light in terms of, you know, how many seconds?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That light changes all of the time.

MR. CAMPANA: It's quick; right?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Exactly. It changes. Different times of the day, it's different. Usually, I would say the average is about five cars could get through it, and that's being generous.

MR. CAMPANA: Right, because you have the Bronx River traffic north and south.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Those cars would back up past that driveway, but being that it's only the salt truck six times a year -- I mean, one of my biggest concerns is the construction of this project and the havoc it's going to take on the community, I mean, the excavation, the trucks, equipment. That two years is going to be tough.

MR. CAMPANA: Deliveries.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Deliveries that say they're going to be there at two but really come at seven. The plan makes sense. I see

why you did what you did.

MR. MAFFIA: As far as the trucks are concerned, during construction we would have most of the truck activity at the beginning of the project during the demolition and excavation for the foundation of the new building. We estimated the number of trucks, I believe that was in our response letter to the Town, and it would be over the course of a few months, and not at that level for the rest of the construction. Once that busy activity at the beginning is done, truck activity would be limited to occasional delivery of materials and not significant -- maybe a few trucks a day for a couple of days. Once the stuff is delivered, then the contractors work with the building materials, with the lumber, with the stone that they have to work with. Later on in the project, equipment is delivered, but it's a flatbed truck probably about the same size as the WD40 salt truck that we talked about. Once the equipment is on site, then it's moved around by a smaller forklift, that kind of thing, that's within the building, putting

everything in place. It's a construction period, but I would say that it's probably not a nightmarish situation. Again, we're parking our workers off site somewhere. Our conditions are going to be acceptable to us not to park on the street so we're not blocking lanes.

MR. CAMPANA: I have one question.

MR. MAFFIA: Sure.

MR. CAMPANA: Mark, do you want to go?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, no go ahead. I was just going to ask about the driveway. I was going to ask if the proposed driveway is going to go in first so that access is there for the whole project?

MR. MAFFIA: Joe could answer that specifically, but I think that during construction, only the Leewood access will be used coming and going.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: It might have been in somebody's comment letter.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That alleviates a lot of it, because, I mean, really that's when you're biggest amount of traffic is there,

during construction.

MR. CAMPANA: So I'm not --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The other --

MR. CAMPANA: Sorry, Mark, go ahead.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The other suggestion or question I had was, we were talking about offsite -- I've done a number of big projects where we bring people in from the outside in areas that are -- for instance, in Rye, some big homes that were built out there, and they basically parked in the Rye Beach parking lot, then they had basically two shuttle buses that brought all our guys in because they couldn't park on the street. You guys have the quite large parking lots over at the facility on California Road, why wouldn't that be considered to put the personal trucks over there and just have a shuttle bus that ran the guys back? It's less than a five minute drive. Just a suggestion.

MR. MAFFIA: That's exactly the kind of thing we're suggesting and would be willing to make a condition of approval, that it would be an offsite location. It could be that, it

could be a yard owned by a contractor who's working on the project somewhere in Eastchester or a neighboring town, where whoever is working with that contractor himself or their self and other --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Or even the golf course.

MR. MAFFIA: -- Would meet there and then carpool over to the site. The golf course is a possibility. It is there. Our focus is to try to keep as much traffic out of the neighborhood as we could. Even if we said we'll park at the golf course, it would mean that the 10 to 12 or so trips that would be made by our workers would end up in that area, in that intersection.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Right. That's true.

MR. MAFFIA: We're trying to keep them out of the neighborhood all together, if we can. Maybe only two or three vehicles access the property around 7:30 in the morning bringing the workers to the site, and then another couple of vehicles leaving the site with them before the PM peak hour. We'll try

to get everybody out of there by 4:00 before the evening peak hour.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's a --

MR. MAFFIA: The -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's a very effective way to do it with the shuttle bus. That's great.

MR. MAFFIA: We agreed we would make that a condition of approval.

THE CHAIRMAN: Quick question on the site plan as we're looking at it. So the drive width is 20 feet. Is that a standard for a drive aisle regardless of the type of truck pulling through it? Most trucks have the same width, don't they? If you shrank to the smaller truck, it would be the length of the truck that would change, not the width of the truck, right, obviously?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Pretty much. Maybe some minor differences. The driveway, we tried to keep it to a minimum recognizing the residential zone as far as width goes. There are some considerations. We do have this

truck. The delivery that's going to happen, we want to make sure we could get another vehicle by that delivery truck at the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's the reason.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: We did want a little space. Certainly as you get toward the exit of the property, when you make that turn and your back end swings out, you do need some pavement there as well. So that was part of it. Mostly it's to get another vehicle by when we have a salt delivery.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why would you need that? The salt delivery comes six times a year. I can't believe the driveway width is based on that occurrence.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: It's a consideration just to have the ability that that driveway is not blocked. We could certainly look at making it --

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be awesome if you could make provisions to just have the width large enough for the truck to get through. If there's another vehicle, they could just wait; right? There's no one there.

It's the guy that monitors the site once a day.

MR. CAMPANA: Basically you're saying it's a 14 foot width, but where you have the turn, that's where you sort of grow a bit on the radius?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes. The entry and the exits would probably need to be larger. You could probably shrink it a little in the middle. Certainly when the salt truck comes, there will be an operator there, so there is going to be another vehicle on site when these deliveries happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: How long is the delivery, when you say the operation for --

MR. BONGIOVANNI: John, can you speak on how long they're usually on site for?

MR. TELESCO: Yes. It's usually about two, two and a half hours.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Excuse me.

MR. TELESCO: Two hours.

MR. CAMPANA: Two hours?

MR. TELESCO: Yes. By the time they get set up. We have to have two operators

present in addition to the driver when they do the delivery.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh. How do they get there then?

MR. TELESCO: They come in in a company vehicle.

THE CHAIRMAN: So there's another vehicle; right?

MR. TELESCO: They may come together or they may come in separate vehicles.

THE CHAIRMAN: They're all together, so they egress in and out together. Okay. The poor operator they keep sitting there for two hours.

MR. CAMPANA: So has there been any analysis in terms of the probability of which Fire Department the truck will becoming from? Is the one in Tuckahoe closer or is the one near Lord & Taylor closer? The reason why I ask is because I see the diagram, I know this is for the salt truck, but just for future reference -- I guess you'll come by this again when you provide the plan for the turning radius on the fire truck -- it looks like the

turn I guess going north on Dale from the fire station in Crestwood would be quite tight. I guess what I'm trying to say is, the fire truck will have to veer into oncoming traffic and then turn up the driveway to get to the facility. Has there been any analysis in terms of that or --

MR. BONGIOVANNI: No. We have completed the turning radius analysis. It has not been presented yet. I have it. I could show it to you today. We just assumed that it would be coming from Leewood similar to the truck traffic that we're going to have, that it would be coming from Leewood, making a left turn into the site, and then exiting from Dale and making a left turn onto Dale.

MR. CAMPANA: In my opinion, I think it should probably be done both ways, only because I would think the Tuckahoe Station is probably closer than the one on Wilmot, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. NEMECEK: The Waverly Station?

MR. CAMPANA: The Waverly?

MR. NEMECEK: Waverly is the closest.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's Eastchester, so there's Main Street, there's Chester Heights, and there's Wilmot. There's three stations in Eastchester Fire Department. I don't know that the Tuckahoe Station would be answering that, so it would be right by Waverly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess we don't know which way they're coming; right?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: They could come from either direction.

THE CHAIRMAN: They come from the easiest direction.

MR. CAMPANA: Thinking out loud here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess you said you're going through this right now, you're trying to see how the fire truck plays on this, and if this driveway is going to change in size, right, or it would have to be modified?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: We did look at it. It should be fine. The turning radius of the vehicle did not cause any issues.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Making a left turn that is. We have not evaluated for a right

turn into the site from Dale.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. So I'm curious about what you said about getting the car situated to go by. If you could look at that and tell us if there is any change, that would be appreciated.

The other thing I would like to see, the renderings from the street, can you we just look back to those, the visuals of what the driveway look like.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: The original renderings?

THE CHAIRMAN: The ones that we saw last time, yes. Is that the only one?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Go back to the one you had. This is what I was referring to. The front is okay, but you see as it goes to the west there, and then that other tree line over there, it looks like it's wrapping around the building because there's no road illustrated in this drawing to the right. I was thinking that the driveway could have just went around the building and came back out where the truck is. This sidewalk is going to be here on the front?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes. We have multiple egress means.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: And it's going to go down Dale Road, the sidewalk? It's going to stop dead at the first house?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: We don't have any real sidewalk.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay, cool. There's not one on Dale Road.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: It's coming around this way.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Oh it is, it's coming around?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It comes around and comes down to the first residential property and stops.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: We have a couple of doors in the back.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You have an apron around the building. I see it on that one there, yes.

MR. CAMPANA: This is from Leewood?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: This is from

Leewood, correct.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You see how you have all that concrete down there, that's the try way; no?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: That's the driveway.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's not drawn correctly.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's not what's on the plan.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's going south. If this is the west elevation of the building, that driveway is heading south, which is what I was saying, take it around and go around the building because everything to the right there is not really accurate.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: I'll have to look at it.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's the one I was referring to when I said that before you showed me the site plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you could do that, that would take all this pavement in front of it and move it to the back so you wouldn't see it; right?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. Just like if all that was blacktop or pavement out in the front, you could turn around in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but I'm saying if this could be moved such that you get it in the back, then all the drives and all the impervious surfaces are in the back of the building and this could be all landscaped or something; right?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. It's saying here, proposed view from Leewood. That's all out in the front of the building on the north elevation facing the golf course.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. Is there enough radius in the back?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: I really don't think so. We're back on the site plan here.

MS. UHLE: You have two single family homes adjacent to that property line in the back.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the back right there. It's good for Leewood, it's not good for them.

Could you just go back to the

renderings, because I just want to get comfortable with them? Can we see the one from street level? Yes, that's good.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Obviously, we talked at the last meeting, I think there will be some changes to the building based on the comments.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not looking at the building, I'm just looking at the drive aisles there. I would like to reduce the size of that as much as possible. You sort of shot yourself in the foot here because I don't think the driveway on the plan is anywhere near this big.

MS. UHLE: Did you commit to the grass pavers, and can you use those and still support the fire truck?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: I think we're looking at concrete pavers as opposed to the grass pavers.

MS. UHLE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why is that; for maintenance?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes. A preference. We could talk about that. We're certainly open to it. I'm not particularly fond of them.

They do work. In the northern areas maybe there are more problems with them because of heaving. If your drain starts to fail underneath, you could have problems.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it sort of not dulls down, but sort of makes this less jump out at you.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: We could definitely consider that. We're talking pavers, so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's good. I think we've seen site issues and discussed them. Does the Board want to continue discussing site issues or do we feel that we have enough to continue moving forward? I mean, I would certainly like to know what the driveway looks like, if you could make it smaller such as we've discussed. I don't think that's an issue that's going to hold me up from saying anything else here just because we have enough time to address that and I'm sure you would. Guys, do you see anything else that needs to be addressed?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No. Basically that's what I was looking for too, an actually

rendering of what it actually looks like with the driveway and all.

MR. NEMECEK: To reiterate my earlier comment, I just want some sort of examination into whether there are any smaller options in terms of a truck that would admittedly require a more frequent delivery. Again, if we're talking once a month instead of once every other month, I don't think that necessarily is a major imposition. If there are other plausible options here, what effect would that have on perhaps -- what effect would it have on the site plan, and on the driveway in particular? Would you need to have a driveway that went from Leewood to Dale, or could you have a smaller truck entering and exiting at the same Leewood road site as you have now? I would like that issue to be explored and an answer provided to the Board.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: We will do that.

MR. NEMECEK: Great.

MR. CERMELE: Mr. Chairman, just a thought. I know the Board is concerned with the massing and the size of the pavement for

the driveway. I believe, I would have to confirm, but I believe Town Code would allow a single drive for parking less than I think it's 30 spaces the width of 12 feet, but the Fire Department would likely require a minimum width of 20 feet for a fire access road, and then there are other requirements for where they could set up the rig in relation to the building and setbacks. So that may very well dictate the driveway width. Maybe the applicant could consider some type of middle of the road solution where maybe 12 or 15 foot width of the drive is concrete pavers, or whatever it may be, and the balance could be some sort of grass paver or some alternative means, so that visually it doesn't have the look that everything in the front of the building has been paved with some hard surface, but it will provide the structural stability for vehicle traffic.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. That's a good point. Okay. So I think I would like to see some of the suggestions put forth before we move forward on this. I think we're all very

much concerned with the aesthetics here and the impact of the drive lane of what it looks like from Leewood. Plus, as Mr. Nemecek brought up, if the use of the smaller truck could help reconfigure this, we should probably address it now. If it doesn't really change anything, then we'll know. I think we're asking that get explored a little bit.

MR. SCIARETTA: Chair, if I may just add a comment if it's okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course.

MR. SCIARETTA: In terms of those issues with respect to the truck, we will look into that. Most of what I'm hearing are I guess indeed site elements. We can always look at those because we have to come back to you obviously for continued preliminary and obviously for final site plan. Just in terms of having this project continue moving forward, we would like to be able to hopefully get on to the Zoning Board and continue that there. Given the time constraints that we have, and if you recall at the last meeting, I mentioned, you know, we have certain regulatory timeframes

that we have to get this done by, so we're just to -- again, all these issues we're going to address with you, it's just a question of hopefully we can get a Negative Declaration this evening to at least allow us to proceed to the Zoning Board knowing that we have to come back and address these site plan elements with you.

While we were discussing also, I was checking with my client, we were texting back and forth just to get some answers. With respect to the truck, and again, we'll confirm this, but my understanding is that the salt truck that they use is the same truck. Sometimes they use less quantity, sometimes more, but my understanding is the truck is going to be the same type of truck. Again, I'm going to have to confirm that because that's something I received via text, but I would have to confirm it, but that's what the client is telling me who knows the protocols with the trucks. So the size of the truck is the same regardless. They load it depending on the capacity with respect to the facility that they

go to. So again, we'll confirm that, but that's what I'm getting right now.

Just again to go back, you know, hopefully, we'll address these site plan elements, and we would just like to see this process moving forward if we can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Understood. Thank you.

MR. NEMECEK: Margaret, is there a Zoning Board meeting between now and our next meeting?

MS. UHLE: Yes. So the ARB is meeting on July 7th, which is Tuesday, the Zoning Board is meeting July 14th, which is Tuesday, and then you're meeting the following Tuesday, July 21st.

One thing I would say about the driveway and trying to reduce the width, etcetera, one of the proposed variances is with regard to impervious surfaces, so I think if you were to refer this to the Zoning Board, you could ask them to ask the applicant to try to minimize the impervious surface to the maximum extent possible because that's what they're

supposed to do any way. You could make them aware that that was a specific concern that you have.

MR. NEMECEK: By the way, on that truck issue, again, and I know the applicant is texting back and forth --

MR. SCIARETTA: We're trying.

MR. NEMECEK: Trying. I understand what we're asking you -- what I'm asking in particular is not the most convenient for you. I would assume you're preferring I wish this guy wouldn't be such a pain --

MR. SCIARETTA: No, not at all.

MR. NEMECEK: -- And certainly it's more convenient for you to use that. If there is another truck that's available, and I don't know who makes the deliveries and whether there is only one outfit that makes this type of delivery and they only have one truck, I do want you to use a little imagination here and find out is it plausible. Look, ultimately, if you could find a smaller truck and that smaller truck has no effect whatsoever on the site plan, well, it really doesn't -- it doesn't

produce anything useful for us. If, as I suspect, there is another truck, a smaller truck, I would think that that should see it's way into some scaling back at least of the impervious surfaces. I haven't heard a lot of -- I know this is a big -- certainly a much larger building, but I think at the last hearing we heard about the reasons why, that there's a lot more being done here, there's -- you have to store certain, you know, chemicals and alike. There's a reason behind it, and I haven't heard a lot of push back from this Board about the size of the massing of the building. It's a lot bigger than what's there right now, but I think that's inevitable given the reason why you've come before us in the first place. I said my piece on this -- on the truck issue in particular.

MR. SCIARETTA: My alarm is going off, hold on.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Is that the tea kettle? The 9:30 tea.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's the fire alarm.

MR. SCIARETTA: Are you there? Sorry

about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: How did you silence it so fast?

MR. SCIARETTA: I see her waving a towel.

THE CHAIRMAN: It takes a long time for us to get rid of it.

MR. SCIARETTA: Fan the flames.

MR. NEMECEK: Please, if you were in any danger, leave right now. It's not that important.

MR. SCIARETTA: To your point, Mr. Nemecek, we will look at and confirm the truck. Again, we want to obviously work on something that's obviously amenable to the Town, so we will look at alternatives. Again, I was trying to get some answers for you right now, but, again, we'll confirm that. Again, it's just a question of trips, whether it's 12, 6 or whatever the number is, we'll look into that and we'll definitely obviously discuss it.

My point is simply, going back, again, these are hopefully it would seem to be site element issues that we can address as we go

through the planning process. That was all.

THE CHAIRMAN: The one issue that we didn't discuss or haven't really gotten to yet is the aesthetics of the building and what the ARB is going to do it, and if we'll be able to come up with a building that's more pleasing to the character of the neighborhood, if there is one here. Usually, I would think before we go to the next step, I would like to be assured it could be done. Right now it's an okay building. I think with a little more work you could fit it into the character and not have it impact on the character of the neighborhood. If it was a steel corrugated warehouse type building, obviously we would put the breaks on it right now. I think there's opportunity here to make this more appealing. I would like to defer to our architect on the Board and ask if he thinks that that could be achieved such that we could vote appropriately tonight or is it something we should hold on to see what they come up with?

MR. CAMPANA: I think with our recommendation to the ARB, they would certainly

look closely at it. I think there is plenty of opportunity, you know, with alignments of windows and doors beneath, where they could sort of minimize the scale of the structure by incorporating some sort of a gable feature, just to bring it back down to Earth, for lack of a better term. I just think the geometric form or the square massing that we have right now, rectangle massing, just isn't reflective of what's going on around the community. Also, I would even look across the street at Leewood at the building there for some sort of inspiration, because I think, you know, these two buildings should probably speak to one level as well.

MR. SCIARETTA: To that point, we have this evening, if you want to take a look, we do have an elevation that we prepared just to share with you just to give you another look at a rendering of a building. Joe, if you could pull that up.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There you go.

MR. SCIARETTA: We're listening. Fire alarms and all, we're listening.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We just need you to get rid of the louvers and garage door.

MR. CAMPANA: Something so simple like that, a very simple projection off of the building, using the different shape, as you have, that sort of I guess you would call it like an English Manor parapet gable, something like that just gives it more character. I think it will be received well by the community. I have no opposition to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Not necessarily this, but I think we could work that out.

MR. CAMPANA: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that being said, Margaret, do we have anything else? Oh, public hearing. We didn't even start on that. I forgot, we have a public hearing. I apologize. Rob, you're over there?

MR. TUDISCO: Yes. We're still in screen sharing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's go to the public and see if there are any comments on this.

MR. TUDISCO: Are there any comments from the public? Just use the raise your hand

feature.

MS. UHLE: I can see who's participating, and they're all applicants at this point.

MR. TUDISCO: So, Mr. Chairman, it does not appear that there are any members of the public offering a comment.

THE CHAIRMAN: They should come by and see this. This is part of the community here.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I don't think there are many folks that know this building is going up. That's really what it comes down to.

MS. UHLE: I have received some phone calls from neighbors, so I know they're are some people in the neighborhood that are aware of it and are aware that the application is posted online.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we leave the hearing open. So, gentlemen, is there any other issues you would like to discuss before we go to the motion about the Neg Dec?

MS. UHLE: I just want to make one quick comment. It's just an administrative

comment. At the last meeting I believe it was, you declared your intent to be lead agency for the coordinated review of the application, which would mean that you would make the Negative Declaration but the Zoning Board would not need to do that. For a variety of reasons, I decided just to do an uncoordinated review, which means you'll do a Negative Dec -- and this is what you typically do -- and the Zoning Board will do a Negative Declaration as well. So they'll look at some of the environmental issues as well, and also rely on the reports from Phil and Joe. That's why in your Resolution I reference the uncoordinated review, and I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I have one more comment about environmental impacts. We really have had no data or anything on any noise levels that are going to be coming out of this building or any of the impacts of the chemicals or anything else that are in the building. I don't know if the Town has gotten data on that.

MS. UHLE: What we've received is what you received. That's what you're evaluated. I

do know that the applicant addressed those concerns in writing. They didn't provide specific data. They did address the concerns with regard to noise and with regard to "hazardous" material.

THE CHAIRMAN: They also addressed the odor, didn't they?

MS. UHLE: By saying there would not be an odor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Correct. Is that technical or there is no odor? Is that sort of what we're being told? As far as noise goes, I think the comment might have been that the emergency generator is there too, and it's really no different than that.

MS. UHLE: I believe they said it would meet the Town's require for a maximum of 65 decibels at the property line, and that it would be tested once a month. Again, the applicant can correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: That's correct.

MS. UHLE: I also think it was compared to the facility on California Road, where we have not received complaints about

odors or noise.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Is the same system in the facility on California Road?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: There is a similar system. It's smaller. California Road had a lot of other things going on on it compared to this facility, but it does have a similar system that we are putting in.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's chlorine you guys are adding to the water; is that correct?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you're producing chlorine with the chemicals that you bring in; the salt or whatever the chemical is?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes, salt water and electricity, and we're making a very low strength chlorine solution.

THE CHAIRMAN: So is that like an enclosed system when you make that?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: It is.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's closed; right? So it's almost odorless, or indeed it is, and the reason is because it's closed; right?

MR. BONGIOVANNI: It is odorless. There really isn't any odor that comes off the system.

THE CHAIRMAN: If anyone has a comment about odor, it just doesn't work. I'm saying in general it seems reasonable to say that. Okay, good. So let me move forward.

So then I'm going to make a motion, guys. I make a motion to adopt a Negative Declaration for the uncoordinated SEQRA review of Application 19-42, and to refer the application to the ZBA for consideration of the area variances.

MS. UHLE: And a use variance as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now that you guys are moving forward, I have lots of good will that you're going to do everything to keep us happy here. We've discussed a lot of things, and I think there's opportunities to make this even nicer and a little bit less of an impact on the

neighborhood. It's very nice that you've gotten this and thank you for preparing this because you knew we were going to ask; right?

MR. SCIARETTA: Of course. Thank you all very much. Enjoy the rest of the week. Enjoy July 4th.

MR. BONGIOVANNI: Thank you very much.

MR. NEMECEK: Margaret, do we have to do anything to change this from coordinated to uncoordinated?

MS. UHLE: You just did.

MR. NEMECEK: We did.

THE CHAIRMAN: ZBA does the coordinated.

Next application is actually three applications.

MS. UHLE: It's four.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's 19-49, 1, 2, 3, 4, and that address is 1,3,5 and 7 Rogliano Way consecutively.

MS. UHLE: Michael, you'll just need to -- there you go.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did brief Michael on how we're going to do this; right?

MS. UHLE: Yes. I'll just remind all of you. You've already reviewed and approved this in 2017. There were four new homes that went before the Architectural Review board, they were reviewed, there were minor modifications made. Then it went to the Planning Board, it was reviewed and approved. It's simply because those approvals expired that applicant is having to come back before the Board again. It did go back before the ARB last month or so, and the ARB reviewed and approved the application as submitted without any recommendations for changes.

The only thing that has changed since you last saw it in 2017, is that Joe Cermele signed off on the storm water management plan. Last time it was a condition of approval that the storm water management plan be further reviewed and approved, but in the interim that's occurred.

So I had asked Michael just to quickly show you the building elevations and the site plan for each of the four residents. If you have any questions about each of them, I would

do it immediately after you hear that particular presentation. Then I think we can just open the public hearing up at the end and address all four of the homes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. With the intent being, we've seen this before, we're seeing it again, but it should be relatively easy to get through.

MS. UHLE: Right, because you've already reviewed and approved it.

MR. NEMECEK: We should make Louis take special notes on this since he didn't see it the previous time. Mark and Jim and I could sort of hang back and let Louis handle all the questioning.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's all yours, Louis.

MR. CAMPANA: Come on, guys.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's go to Mike.

MS. UHLE: Mike, do you want to go ahead?

MR. FINELLI: Absolutely. Good evening, everyone. Thank you for hearing my application this evening. I'm going to try to

make it short and sweet. Margaret did a great introduction for me. As she said, we're just looking for another approval or, I guess, reapproving what was already approved. We did receive ARB approval back in February for this project the second time. Now we're here before you just to kind of remind you what the project was, refresh your memory, and then answer any questions that I can.

I'm going to share my screen and just kind of walk through the plans just very quickly as far as the elevations go, the renderings. You might be able to see them over my shoulder. I figured it might make it a little bit easier, but it's a little difficult to see. I'm going to share my screen now and I'll walk you through it. Please ask me question as you want. I'm going to go pretty quickly. I don't want to keep you here too long, but I'm going anywhere. I apologize, I'm new to this. I got the hang of it, I'm pretty good, but I just want to make sure I can show you what needs to be shown.

So the project is a full lot

subdivision off of Water Street just north -- I'm sorry -- of Stewart, so it's just north of Stewart in the orientation that this drawing is showing. The road is now known as Rogliano Way. The houses had received numbers. We were numbering them 1, 2, 3, 4 basically coming around the cul-de-sac in a clockwise fashion, but they've been numbered 1, 3, 5 and 7. So the project you're looking at right here is number 1. Basically this lot is two and a half times what is normally required in an R-5 zone, just to kind of put it in perspective and remind you of where we're at.

I'm going to quickly just go through, again, the elevations, and any questions that you might have, please ask. This house is two and a half stories. The garage enters from the left-hand side of this front elevation. If you look over at that elevation right there, that's coming off of Water Street. The intention is to use the grade change in the elevations to be able to get in and out of the project very easily without having to add a bunch more impervious surface driveways, retaining walls,

things of that nature. I would just kind of pan around quickly to show you the rear elevation of the house, and then the right-hand side. The house, as far as materials, I'll just go through them quick. It's going to be stucco. It will be gray in color. There's going to be stone across the base at the staircase and in spots across the front, if I remember correctly. Yes, across the front of the house. It's going to be square cut, gray in coloring. The house is very gray and white, very popular with what's on the market today. We wanted to try to appeal to as many buyers as possible, and at the same time keep the same look that you'll see driving down every street in Eastchester. The front door will be black, all the trim is going to be white AZEK, and we'll have a gray roof. It will be a Clopay stained garage door for a little character, being that is the biggest elevation on the house. I wanted to break it up a little bit with that bump out and also with the garage and basically set it off from what happens and recedes behind it.

I'm going to keep going, if that's okay, unless you have any questions with this particular drawing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just what's the material for the building?

MR. FINELLI: I'll pull up a rendering. It might show it to you a little bit better. It's going to be a stucco and gray square cut stone across the base. Would it be easier for me to show you the renderings or would you like me to go through the plans the way I just did?

MR. CAMPANA: Renderings are fine.

MR. FINELLI: Renderings. Okay. So this is lot 1, the first house on the left as you get into the property. The next house, again as we're coming around the cul-de-sac now clockwise, is now known as how number 3, which, as you can see, is, once again, a farmhouse colonial. I'll talk to you just about the materials. All of these houses, by the way, are on oversized lots. Basically we had larger setbacks. Because it was a subdivision, we held I believe it was 10 feet to the side

yards -- I'm sorry, I might be confusing my numbers. Our setbacks were a little bit larger. We were holding our 10 setbacks for the project. So they're oversized lots but still R-5 sized. So a lot of property, smaller houses. This particular house is going to be Hardie Board. Navajo beige is the color that we're looking to put on it. All the stucco on all the projects will be gray. That is a common theme, this way we can keep that same color scheme going throughout the entire project. The front door is going to be black. We're doing a gray roof on this one. It's a little bit of a darker gray. It's a GAF roof. We're doing a white Clopay garage door, and all the fixtures will be black.

Again, I'm just going to keep going through them, unless you guys have questions, please stop me.

MR. CAMPANA: Two comments. One is, the front door and I guess what's next to it is a panel down below and a double hung; is that what that is?

MR. FINELLI: Let me just go back to

it.

MR. CAMPANA: Under the portico. Also, the second comment is, the window that's up in the gable, I would bring that down probably about 18 to 24 inches.

MR. FINELLI: So what you're looking are all -- these are comments that were actually made by the ARB and Planning Board in our last revision set. They wanted to see more of panelized look above the garage door, and below the double hung window next to the door, they wanted a little more detail. The reason the window in the gable is where it is, is because it's set up off of the floor in the attic. That was a vent at one time, and it was asked of us to make it a window. So my thought was to engage the upper trim into the sub rake and trim out that entire upper gable. I just think it's a nicer detail and a nicer way to finish it than just to kind of float it in the middle of the gable end. It will also bring it much closer to the floor in the attic, which I really didn't want to do. It gives it more proportion between that and the do you believe

window below it. I hope that answers your question.

MR. CAMPANA: That's fine.

MR. FINELLI: Okay. Should I go along or do you want to look at it a little more?

MR. CAMPANA: No, keep going.

MR. FINELLI: Okay. So the next house is 5 Rogliano Way. It is the third house on the left as you come up the cul-de-sac. This house is more to the Tudor size coloring --

THE CHAIRMAN: Hold on. I don't have 5 up yet. Do you guys see it?

MS. UHLE: I see it.

MR. CAMPANA: I see it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's weird. All right, keep going. It is now. There you go.

MR. FINELLI: I should say, the houses range in size from 2300 square feet up to 2600. So they're not massive houses, as per, I guess, what that lot size would actually accommodate in an R-10. This house is going to be stucco, beige. The stucco here will also be beige. The windows are going to be beige. That was actually a change that we had made this year.

We had originally had the trim on this color house as white, and it wasn't picked up, not by myself and not by the Boards, but once I did this rendering and I had all the trim work and rake boards and sub rakes -- I'm sorry the fascias and the sub fascias all dressed in white, it just didn't look right. So we decided to make them beige to keep with the look that you see here. I think it's much better, much more appropriate. All of our trim will be AZEK. It will be painted to match. The front door here will be red because I want it to set off from all of the beige. I think it make a nice contrast with the weathered wood roof, which is more of a brown color. We're doing a stain mahogany Clopay door. The rendering is a little bit more brownish but it's actually leaning more to a red to tie in more with the front door. Any fixtures that are seen, which are specifically in the back of house, will be bronze, a rubbed oil bronze to match more with the coloring of this particular scheme.

I'm going to actually show you a

drawing of -- let's see -- I'm sorry, of all three houses side by side to one another and try to explain away the roof lines just very quickly. I apologize, I have it in another folder. This is my first time Zooming, so I apologize if I'm a little slower than most.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're doing well.

MR. FINELLI: This is a street-scape basically showing lot 1 on the left, 3, 5, and then 7. As we're coming around the cul-de-sac, just to show you the height relations from one house to the next. Lot 1 happens to be the lowest house in the entire project and the one closest to Water Street, and yet, we're able to put a driveway under it. You can see from Water Street up to lot 3, there is a pretty good slope in there, I would say it's somewhere in the 10 foot range, but the houses are within 6 feet of one another. I think the greatest difference is right here, 6 foot 11 inches. The rest are -- bear with me -- 2 foot 11 is the difference between this house here and this one, and 11 inches between these two -- I'm sorry, 5 and a quarter inches between these two

guys. The idea was to make this a hip roof so as you're coming around the project, you could see it pretty much here. The hip roof will actually lend itself to creating more air space between the two houses, and actually make it feel like there's more space, you know, beyond the second floor so they're no cramping up onto one another. So I was trying to play with the architectural features to make the houses look even further away from one another, even though they really aren't. I mean, the setbacks are still quite considerable.

I'm going to jump back to 7 Rogliano Way just to go through that very quickly, and then I'll answer any questions you have. So 7 is more of your traditional home. I think every other house in Eastchester pretty much looks like this these days. It's got your typical portico at the front of the house. It's a two story colonial with a bumped out bay in the front. It also has this bay window to break up the mass right here at the garage, which goes underneath the house. As you come around the property, now it starts to drop off

again going back towards Water Street. Once again, without changing any of the grades or any of the elevations almost that are there, we were able to tuck the garage underneath and not have to create a bigger footprint to the building itself. Again, this house is 2400 square feet, so it's not a monstrous house, and we still managed to get every amenity in there that you can get into these houses. That detail, again, with the window up at the top of the gable, we're just kind of tying those similar elements in and through, the similar color roofs, the gray stuccoes, the beige siding here to match more with the beige stucco next door. So a lot of just tying together of colors and shapes.

So I really don't have much more. Again, it was just a quick reminder of what you guys approved, and I'm happy to answer any questions. I believe you have the plans in front of you. If there's anything you want to see, I'm happy to answer. I'll send it back to you guys.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you

for the presentation and for the speed at which you gave it. Thank you for the idea using the rendering and whoever approved that. Let me see. I have no comments. Maybe I remember these from last time, but they're very well done. They're handsome homes. Good work.

MR. FINELLI: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Guys?

MR. NEMECEK: Seen it before and it still looks good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Looks good. Looks better tonight. So then we'll do the public hearing.

So I make a motion to open the public hearing on these applications, 14-49, 1, 3, 5 and 7 Rogliano Way.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

MS. UHLE: We're down to two applicants and Mr. King.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. King. Who's he? Does he have any comments?

So I make a motion to close the public

hearing on these applications 19-49, 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 3, 5 and 7 Rogliano Way.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: So we'll just keeping keep going. So I make a motion to approve the Applications 19-49, 1, 3, 4 and --

MS. UHLE: And 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: 1, 3, 5 and 7 Rogliano Way respectively.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Michael.

MR. FINELLI: Thank you all very much. Happy holidays and stay safe.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you. Stay safe.

MR. FINELLI: Bye bye, all.

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't think about the landscape architect, Margaret.

MS. UHLE: I'll talk to Michael about that. He's aware of those. Those were part of

the previous approval. Sorry, I was negligent on that too.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, you weren't negligent, Margaret.

MS. UHLE: We'll, have our typical condition with regard to the landscape architect signing off on the landscaping. Also, the only thing Joe Cermele's most recent memo said was that the test holes should be done on each individual property prior to issuance of the building permit. Michael, you're still here.

MR. FINELLI: I'm still with you.

MS. UHLE: So we'll add those two conditions. Did you hear those?

MR. FINELLI: I did. I'm sorry to interject, I know we closed the public hearing and all, but the landscape plans were all approved. Anthony Zaino is the landscape architect.

MS. UHLE: The plans are fine. The condition is, that after they're implemented, then he has to send a letter to the Building Department verifying that they've been

implemented according to the approved plans. Then according to Joe Cermele's memo, soil testing on each lot much be coordinated with the Town Engineer prior to the issuance of a building permit. So those will be the two conditions for each house.

MR. FINELLI: I actually spoke with Jo Cermele -- actually, I believe the engineer spoke with him and I spoke with the engineer. He did mention that to you us, but he said that shouldn't hold up the building permit, make it a condition of, and then we could follow-up with the Building Department. So we are aware of that.

MS. UHLE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FINELLI: Thanks again, all. Stay safe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next application is 20-10, 100 Johnson Road.

MR. CAMPANA: I have to step away for one second, but you're in my ear so I hear you.

MS. UHLE: We're waiting for Adamo. Here he comes.

MR. MAIORANO: Good evening, Board

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

members, Chairman. Nice to see everybody again. My name is Adamo Maiorano from Community Designs and Engineering. We are proposing additions and alterations to 100 Johnson Road. I'm going to share my screen so you could see it in the back.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I like your background.

MR. MAIORANO: Thank you. Can you see the screen?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MAIORANO: Okay. As I was saying, the house, 100 Johnson Road, as it exists today is situated on the front right corner of the lot, it's in an R-5 zoning district. It may be considered almost like a tiny home. It's around 800 square feet. What we are proposing essentially in the front is an attached one car garage with a room above, that's basically a dormer, and the bulk of the addition will take place in the rear of the residence. It will be a two story addition towards the rear with a proposed deck off of the first floor. The property slopes down, so with the grade change

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

the back basement today it does have a walkout basement, but we'll be extending that basement and create another walkout basement to the patio area in the rear, along with some site alterations extending the driveway in the front as well for two car access.

I'm going to go to the elevations. So as I was mentioning, the house is going to receive all new finishes throughout. The siding will be white HardiePlank siding. The stone, what you see there today if you could see from the pictures, it's actually a stuccoed stone, so we're going to removing that, putting in new real thin stone veneer on the front right side of the first floor and a water table along the garage, along with AZEK white soffits, finishes, trim. The front door and the garage door will be as depicted, they will be black doors to match the accent of the Andersen black windows, as well as the simulated divided light, they'll be as what is shown in the elevation, the four over one pattern. The rest of the house will have the same finishes throughout. The roof will be a

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

new architectural asphalt shingle roof that's a charcoal color, and the black railing and the deck in the back is a PVC railing which will pick up the accent of the black as well with the white.

Now as far as the lighting is concerned, we're going to have typical sconce lighting on the front door, barn style lighting on the garage door, as well as the back door as well, and the basement, and then soffit light in the first floor door into the deck in the rear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, is the stone at the water table different than the stone on the --

MR. MAIORANO: It's all going to match. It's the same stone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you zoom in?

MR. MAIORANO: Yes. That's the natural sort of pattern color. If you see it today, it does look like it has some stone on -- actually, I'll go to the pictures. The existing stone is going to be removed because it's just a stucco fake stone veneer. You

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

could sort of see it in maybe in that picture there. It's fake stone. It's actually not stone, it's stucco. It's going to be removed and we're going to put the same stone on the front and the garage water table. Also, you see in that picture the front portico. We're going to switch that up. It's sort of enclosed there, so we're going to renovate that and make it more of a true open portico with columns and a similar roof to match the gable that we're proposing above the garage.

THE CHAIRMAN: Looks very good.

MR. MAIORANO: Just basically in the street-scape, it sort of also gives it more of a -- the house as it is today kind of stands out, and the addition will kind of help tie it in with the neighborhood with the garage and the addition similar to the neighboring residences, as you can see throughout the neighborhood. It sort of helps it blend in so-to-speak.

That's pretty much it in a nutshell. Just site features. The proposed new condensers will just be located in the rear

underneath the deck, the proposed deck.

Site drainage. We'll be doing new site drainage per the added impervious area with Cultec units in the rear and front to tie into the new driveway and the front portion of the house as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Very nice. Thank you. Comments?

(No comments.)

THE CHAIRMAN: So, Margaret, are there any comments about the drainage that have to be made or it works?

MS. UHLE: No. For new construction, we have Joe Cermele look at that. For additions and alterations, we review that in-house, but that's always a requirement. So our plan reviewer ensures that the storm water management is being handled properly.

THE CHAIRMAN: So then I'll open the public hearing. I make a motion to open the public hearing on Application 20-10, 100 Johnson Road.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

MR. TUDISCO: I don't see anyone raising their hand at this time to offer a comment. If anyone does, please raise your hand and I'll invite you to un-mute yourself.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's the last applicant and Mr. King?

MS. UHLE: That's right.

THE CHAIRMAN: So then I make a motion to close the public hearing on Application 20-10, 100 Johnson Road.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it's so well done, that even if we had more time, I wouldn't have anything to say.

MR. NEMECEK: I just wanted to add as a compliment, that the photograph of the house that is showing on the screen here looks like something is missing from it, and you've supplied that missing piece. It looks off balance. It's towards the edge of the property, and by adding the garage and the

space above it, the second floor, it actually looks like you filled out the house to what it's supposed to look like.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Great looking house.

MR. CAMPANA: I think it was successful and also in keeping with the neighborhood in terms of the massing and width of the homes on the side and across the side.

MR. MAIORANO: We created more of a roof in the front of the addition, so it's not a big scale home.

MR. NEMECEK: Thank you for the presentation as well showing the street-scape on it. That's quite helpful for our analysis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We're a tough crowd. Have a good night. Thank you.

MR. MAIORANO: Thank you, everybody. Be safe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Last application is 20-14, 95 Parkway Circle.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We closed the public hearing, you have to approve that one?

MR. NEMECEK: We closed the public hearing and then we commented but we didn't

approve it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I make a motion to approve Application 20-10, 100 Johnson Road.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's what we're here for.

MR. MAIORANO: Thank you, again. Have a great summer.

THE CHAIRMAN: I already said what the last application is, so I'll just wait.

MS. UHLE: He's coming.

MR. NEMECEK: He covered the 10:00 spot.

MR. GIZZO: Hello. Am I muted?

MS. UHLE: No, you're fine.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's all yours.

MR. GIZZO: It's all mine. Where do I start? We have proposed additions and alterations.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Tell us who you are.

MR. GIZZO: Anthony Gizzo, A & R Property Ventures.

I'll put it up. Hopefully you're looking at what I'm looking at.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the elevations.

MR. GIZZO: There's the existing elevation on the bottom right of what the house looks like, and we propose a two story addition above it, second floor addition I should say, raising the roof line, and a two car garage off to the left with also two bedrooms above it. Any questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you just tell us something about the finishes?

MR. GIZZO: The finish is going to be a Hardie Board beige. The roof was weather wood. Asphalt shingle GAF 30 year. Andersen windows 400 series.

THE CHAIRMAN: The front door and garage doors, what color are they and all the trim?

MR. GIZZO: Brown, stained brown, and the trim is all going to be white AZEK.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a site plan?

MR. GIZZO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So all of the walkways

are the same as existing, you're not touching anything?

MR. GIZZO: Yes. We're going to end up putting new stones down, new blacktop.

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems like there is no change to the impervious?

MR. GIZZO: No. Well, there is a little on the left side.

MR. CAMPANA: The garage is getting a little bit bigger; right?

MR. GIZZO: Correct. We're getting rid of the breezeway and extending it over.

THE CHAIRMAN: Got it.

MR. GIZZO: You could see it up on the top right. It's probably like, I don't know, 5 feet wider and it goes back 5 feet.

THE CHAIRMAN: It takes us awhile to wrap our heads around something in black and white, so I apologize.

Guys, any questions or comments?

(No comments or questions.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand it. Go back to the elevations and run through the colors again, the HardiePlank is -- just go

through the colors one more time.

MR. GIZZO: Beige.

THE CHAIRMAN: Beige. Got it. Roof is weathered wood, is that what you said? That's like a brownish?

MR. GIZZO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: White trim?

MR. CAMPANA: Windows are white; right?

MR. GIZZO: Windows are white.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gutter are white I guess; right?

MR. GIZZO: Yes. Leaders are white.

MR. CAMPANA: What are you doing with the garage doors?

MR. GIZZO: Insulated metal look like wood.

MR. CAMPANA: Right. They're going to be white or be like a faux stain color?

MR. GIZZO: No, a stain color.

MR. CAMPANA: Stain?

MR. GIZZO: Yes, to match the door.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did the ARB -- I'm sorry, let's finish the colors. The front door

is the same color?

MR. GIZZO: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Got it. The columns?

MR. GIZZO: White.

THE CHAIRMAN: White. Good. This went to the ARB; they didn't have any comments on it?

MS. UHLE: They did have comments. I could go over those quickly. The first comment was to consider a solid front door that was more consistent with what they said was a Dutch Colonial style of the home, so Anthony did change the style of the front door. They recommended a solid door with two side lights. It looks like, Anthony, you kept the single side light.

MR. GIZZO: Yes. I kept the single side light because there's actually a closet on the right side. So in order to put another side light, I would lose the closet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. You have to move the door over.

MS. UHLE: They asked that he provide a gable roof over the front portico, which he

did. To hide the proposed leaders adjacent to the front portico, and they recommended that maybe hide them behind the columns. I don't know if that was possible, but he did bring them closer to the columns. Previously, they came straight down sort of parallel to the columns and they were more noticeable. They actually asked him to consider replacing the bay window on the left side of the front door with just the double hung window to create a little more balance, but then he chose to add another bay window to create that balance. That was it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are they the same size, those two windows, or the one on the right is smaller?

MR. GIZZO: The one on the right is actually just set back.

MR. CAMPANA: It looks like it's not as wide, but, right, it is set back on the elevation.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the shingles on top of all of the bay windows, they all match what's on the roof obviously?

MR. GIZZO: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: They're not black, they're the same color?

MR. GIZZO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Hardie Board in front of the gable by the front door, that's the same thing, that's vertical Hardie Board?

MR. GIZZO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. I'm okay. Anything else guys?

(No comments.)

THE CHAIRMAN: No. So I make a motion to open the application on 20-14, 95 Parkway Circle -- open the public hearing. All in favor.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: I make a motion to open the public hearing on Application 20-14, 95 Parkway Circle.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: Got it that time.

MR. TUDISCO: Mr. Chairman, it does

not appear there is anyone wishing to offer a comment to the Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Same motion to close the public hearing on this application, 20-14, 95 Parkway Circle.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: Good. Okay, Mr. Gizzo, you're good to go. So I'll make a motion --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Got to approve it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know. I make a motion to approve Application 20-14, Parkway Circle.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you. I think that's everything, right, Margaret?

MS. UHLE: That's everything. You have a special meeting scheduled for July 21st, which you said at the beginning of the meeting. Since that wasn't previously posted, I just wanted to say that again.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: What day is that; it's a Tuesday?

MS. UHLE: Tuesday, July 21st at 7:00. I'm assuming it will be a Zoom meeting again. We're actually only permitted to have remote meetings until July 7th, but I'm assuming that the Governor will extend that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, everyone, for coming in for that meeting. I think we're breaking the law actually here. There weren't very many applications on, are there, Margaret?

MS. UHLE: No, it will not be a long agenda. It's just to wrap things up that got delayed because of the two meetings that you missed previously.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's what's on the back page of this, plus the one that was adjourned.

MS. UHLE: There may be one or two more, but at a minimum, what's on the agenda now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you. So I'll make a motion to close the Eastchester Planning Board meeting of June 25th, 2020.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
(Aye)
THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, guys. Good night.

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)

CERTIFICATION

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 videotape of the actual hearing. I was not present for such hearing. The videotape 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 8th day of October, 2020.

Dina M. Morgan

DINA M. MORGAN
Court Reporter

CORRECTION SHEET

PAGE	CORRECTION