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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.
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, etc., 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 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

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 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

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 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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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 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
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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 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.

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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 satisfactorily 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.

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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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这样一个m.
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

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

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
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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,
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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...
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2. their work or did they -- is that one study?
3. MR. CERMELE: That's what they're
4. proposing right now. They're proposing to
5. study a manhole and televiser 3,000 feet of
6. sewer pipe. We haven't defined the 3,000 feet
7. that would be televised yet. My only concern
8. is that we do this work -- if you were to agree
9. to the proposal as it is, once they do this
10. work, they've satisfied that condition, but
11. there's no guarantee that we find the volume
12. that we're looking for.
13. THE CHAIRMAN: So the whole three to
14. one ratio wouldn't actually be put to use, we
15. would just be studying here.
16. MR. CERMELE: It go either way. We
17. could get more than we needed, we could get
18. less. Until the study is done, we won't know.
19. MS. UHLE: Joe, didn't you say rather
20. than have them do the study that they proposed,
21. you were recommending sitting down with the
22. Highway Superintendent and maybe have them
23. study an area that he already knows is
24. problematic? They've proposed this particular
25. scenario, but if I'm understanding correctly,
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2. to avoid what you're suggesting, Jim, that they
3. may not find anything, maybe meet with the
4. Highway Superintendent and Joe Cermele to
5. discuss where we know there's problematic
6. areas.
7. To be clear, especially if residents
8. are listening, nothing has to be decided
9. tonight. There are options for mitigation
10. measures, and one was to hear back from the
11. MTA. This will be at least a month or so
12. before the Zoning Board, we have the August
13. break, plus it will be coming back to the ARB,
14. plus it will coming back to you. So there is
15. time to keep evaluating this and looking into
16. what the best option is.
17. THE CHAIRMAN: I see. So we don't
18. have to decide on this right now, we could
19. wait.
20. MS. UHLE: No. In fact, I don't think
21. you should. Joe's recommending sitting down
22. with the applicant and the Highway
23. Superintendent, who is very familiar with the
24. sanitary sewer systems, and maybe coming up
25. with a solution that everybody feels will work

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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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.

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.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I don't.

MR. NEMECEK: I just want to point out...
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1. 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.
2. MR. TUDISCO: He does. His hand has been withdrawn.
3. MS. UHLE: Maybe he's having trouble.
4. He's back.
5. MR. CAMPANA: Do you hear the birds in the background?
6. THE CHAIRMAN: We definitely like the birds.
7. MR. TUDISCO: Mr. Sweeney, you can un-mute yourself if you want to make a comment.
8. Just please identify yourself first.
9. 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.
10. 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 --
11. MS. UHLE: They did. I forwarded that
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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 sheer 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
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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
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.

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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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 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 to I guess we could
address pretty quickly is the comment about the

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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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
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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

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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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.
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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
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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
d
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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

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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1 make a motion to adopt a Negative Declaration
2 for the SEQRA review of Application 19-42, and
3 refer the application to the ZBA for the
4 consideration of the area variances.
5
6 MR. NEMECZEK: Second.
7
8 THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
9
10 (Aye)

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. That's good
12 news. The public hearing is open and it's
13 going to remain open until your application
14 comes back to us. Thank you very much,
15 gentlemen.
16
17 MR. BOHLANDER: Thank you guys very
18 much.
19
20 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Have a good
21 evening.
22
23 The next application is 20-13,
24 Troublesome Brook Pumping Station at 10 Leewood
25 Drive.

26 MS. UHLE: Give me a minute to set
27 people up here. Do I have everyone? They're
28 coming.
29
30 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, the whole team is
31 there?
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1 MS. UHLE: Yes. Lino, can you see if
2 I'm missing anyone? I think I have everyone.
3
4 MR. SCIARETTA: I think you do,
5 Margaret. Steve, Joe. I think we have
6 everyone.
7
8 MS. UHLE: I do have a call-in user
9 that's not identified. That may be Vince. Did
10 he want to participate as well or is he
11 listening in? I'm not sure who this is because
12 it's not identifying who it is.
13
14 MR. SCIARETTA: I believe Vince was
15 calling in.
16
17 MS. UHLE: Okay, so we'll see.
18
19 MR. SCIARETTA: Hopefully it's Vince.
20
21 MS. UHLE: It's not allowing me to
22 promote him. Vince, are you there?
23
24 MR. FERRANDINO: Yes, I'm here.
25
26 MS. UHLE: Okay, there you go. Now
27 you're all set. Everyone is here.
28
29 MR. FERRANDINO: Yes, I am, I'm here.
30
31 MS. UHLE: Okay.
32
33 THE CHAIRMAN: So if I may, I think,
34 as the applicant probably knows, the reason
35 we're here is to try to do the same thing we
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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
DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

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
DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

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
nenailing 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
DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

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
DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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 everything.
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---

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

---

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.


---

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
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

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
gone 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.
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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
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EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

current layout and some of the site
3 elements, fencing and whatnot, have really been
4 addressed. There are some very minor
5 outstanding items to deal with. Some of the
6 details and nuances with utility clearances,
7 resurfacing on Dale and/or Leewood, as Mr.
8 Grealy had already discussed, and certainly
9 some of the traffic issues that he just
10 finished speaking about.
11 From the site engineering and civil
12 engineering aspect, I think we're at a very
13 good point with the plan. They provided a
14 storm water mitigation system to mitigate peak
15 rates of runoff from the site or generated by
16 the site through the hundred year storm event,
17 so we are satisfied with the mitigation system
18 they proposed. As far as our memos go and our
19 latest memo, I think any smaller or remaining
20 items could easily be addressed during site
21 plan approval or a condition of site plan
22 approval should it get to that point.
23 I did note in my memo that there were
24 some comments from the Fire Department. If you
25 would like, I could just go through some of the

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

current layout and some of the site
3 elements, fencing and whatnot, have really been
4 addressed. There are some very minor
5 outstanding items to deal with. Some of the
6 details and nuances with utility clearances,
7 resurfacing on Dale and/or Leewood, as Mr.
8 Grealy had already discussed, and certainly
9 some of the traffic issues that he just
10 finished speaking about.
11 From the site engineering and civil
12 engineering aspect, I think we're at a very
13 good point with the plan. They provided a
14 storm water mitigation system to mitigate peak
15 rates of runoff from the site or generated by
16 the site through the hundred year storm event,
17 so we are satisfied with the mitigation system
18 they proposed. As far as our memos go and our
19 latest memo, I think any smaller or remaining
20 items could easily be addressed during site
21 plan approval or a condition of site plan
22 approval should it get to that point.
23 I did note in my memo that there were
24 some comments from the Fire Department. If you
25 would like, I could just go through some of the

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

current layout and some of the site
3 elements, fencing and whatnot, have really been
4 addressed. There are some very minor
5 outstanding items to deal with. Some of the
6 details and nuances with utility clearances,
7 resurfacing on Dale and/or Leewood, as Mr.
8 Grealy had already discussed, and certainly
9 some of the traffic issues that he just
10 finished speaking about.
11 From the site engineering and civil
12 engineering aspect, I think we're at a very
13 good point with the plan. They provided a
14 storm water mitigation system to mitigate peak
15 rates of runoff from the site or generated by
16 the site through the hundred year storm event,
17 so we are satisfied with the mitigation system
18 they proposed. As far as our memos go and our
19 latest memo, I think any smaller or remaining
20 items could easily be addressed during site
21 plan approval or a condition of site plan
22 approval should it get to that point.
23 I did note in my memo that there were
24 some comments from the Fire Department. If you
25 would like, I could just go through some of the

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

current layout and some of the site
3 elements, fencing and whatnot, have really been
4 addressed. There are some very minor
5 outstanding items to deal with. Some of the
6 details and nuances with utility clearances,
7 resurfacing on Dale and/or Leewood, as Mr.
8 Grealy had already discussed, and certainly
9 some of the traffic issues that he just
10 finished speaking about.
11 From the site engineering and civil
12 engineering aspect, I think we're at a very
13 good point with the plan. They provided a
14 storm water mitigation system to mitigate peak
15 rates of runoff from the site or generated by
16 the site through the hundred year storm event,
17 so we are satisfied with the mitigation system
18 they proposed. As far as our memos go and our
19 latest memo, I think any smaller or remaining
20 items could easily be addressed during site
21 plan approval or a condition of site plan
22 approval should it get to that point.
23 I did note in my memo that there were
24 some comments from the Fire Department. If you
25 would like, I could just go through some of the

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020
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8 Grealy had already discussed, and certainly
9 some of the traffic issues that he just
10 finished speaking about.
11 From the site engineering and civil
12 engineering aspect, I think we're at a very
13 good point with the plan. They provided a
14 storm water mitigation system to mitigate peak
15 rates of runoff from the site or generated by
16 the site through the hundred year storm event,
17 so we are satisfied with the mitigation system
18 they proposed. As far as our memos go and our
19 latest memo, I think any smaller or remaining
20 items could easily be addressed during site
21 plan approval or a condition of site plan
22 approval should it get to that point.
23 I did note in my memo that there were
24 some comments from the Fire Department. If you
25 would like, I could just go through some of the

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020

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

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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Mr. Cermel 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. Cermel 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
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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
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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
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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
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/25/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes, I can. I'll share my screen. You can see this now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>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 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 one of the other reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>MR. CUNNINGHAM: There's 72 feet from the eastern side of the building out to Oakland Avenue?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR. CUNNINGHAM: I never really saw a drawing of the building and the proximity of the Eastern Promenade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR. BONGIOVANNI: We have, as part of the application package, the Planning Board drawings, there was a turning radius drawing in that set.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR. BONGIOVANNI: That's correct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's just old piping that's going to be changed out or different sizes added in or whatever to upgrade the system?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR. BONGIOVANNI: A little bit of everything, yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 is that just too tight?

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

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That would have to go back around and come out at the same time because it's too 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 come out from Leewood.

If you're coming down Leewood towards the tunnel, you could turn on to Dale.
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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
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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
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Everything is 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,
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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 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
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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
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2. It's the guy that monitors the site once a day.
3. **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?
4. **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.
5. **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay.
6. **MR. CUNNINGHAM:** How long is the delivery, when you say the operation for --
7. **MR. BONGIOVANNI:** John, can you speak on how long they're usually on site for?
8. **MR. TELESICO:** Yes. It's usually about two, two and a half hours.
9. **MR. CUNNINGHAM:** Excuse me.
10. **MR. TELESICO:** Two hours.
11. **MR. CAMPANA:** Two hours?
12. **MR. TELESICO:** Yes. By the time they get set up. We have to have two operators.
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2. present in addition to the driver when they do the delivery.
3. **THE CHAIRMAN:** Oh. How do they get there then?
4. **MR. TELESICO:** They come in in a company vehicle.
5. **THE CHAIRMAN:** So there's another vehicle; right?
6. **MR. TELESICO:** They may come together or they may come in separate vehicles.
7. **THE CHAIRMAN:** They're all together, so they egress in and out together. Okay. The poor operator they keep sitting there for two hours.
8. **MR. CAMPANA:** So has there been any analysis in terms of the probability of which Fire Department the truck will becoming from?
9. 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
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1. turn into the site from Dale.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. MR. BONGIOVANNI: The original renderings?
5. THE CHAIRMAN: The ones that we saw last time, yes. Is that the only one?
6. 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 on the front?
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1. MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes. We have multiple egress means.
2. MR. CUNNINGHAM: And it's going to go down Dale Road, the sidewalk? It's going to stop dead at the first house?
3. MR. BONGIOVANNI: We don't have any real sidewalk.
4. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay, cool. There's not one on Dale Road.
5. MR. BONGIOVANNI: It's coming around this way.
6. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Oh it is, it's coming around?
7. MR. BONGIOVANNI: Yes.
8. MR. CUNNINGHAM: It comes around and comes down to the first residential property and stops.
9. MR. BONGIOVANNI: We have a couple of doors in the back.
10. MR. CUNNINGHAM: You have an apron around the building. I see it on that one there, yes.
11. MR. CAMPANA: This is from Leewood?
12. MR. BONGIOVANNI: This is from
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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.
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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
eough 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
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2 much concerned with the aesthetics here and the
3 impact of the drive lane of what it looks like
4 from Leewood. Plus, as Mr. Nemecek brought up,
5 if the use of the smaller truck could help
6 reconfigure this, we should probably address it
7 now. If it doesn’t really change anything,
8 then we’ll know. I think we’re asking that get
9 explored a little bit.
10 MR. SCIARETTA: Chair, if I may just
11 add a comment if it’s okay.
12 THE CHAIRMAN: Of course.
13 MR. SCIARETTA: In terms of those
14 issues with respect to the truck, we will look
15 into that. Most of what I’m hearing are I
16 guess indeed site elements. We can always look
17 at those because we have to come back to you
18 obviously for continued preliminary and
19 obviously for final site plan. Just in terms
20 of having this project continue moving forward,
21 we would like to be able hopefully get on to
22 the Zoning Board and continue that there.
23 Given the time constraints that we have, and if
24 you recall at the last meeting, I mentioned,
25 you know, we have certain regulatory timeframes
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2 go to. So again, we’ll confirm that, but
3 that’s what I’m getting right now.
4 Just again to go back, you know,
5 hopefully, we’ll address these site plan
6 elements, and we would just like to see this
7 process moving forward if we can.
8 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Understood.
9 Thank you.
10 MR. NEMECEK: Margaret, is there a
11 Zoning Board meeting between now and our next
12 meeting?
13 MS. UHLE: Yes. So the ARB is meeting
14 on July 7th, which is Tuesday, the Zoning Board
15 is meeting July 14th, which is Tuesday, and
16 then you’re meeting the following Tuesday, July
17 21st.
18 One thing I would say about the
19 driveway and trying to reduce the width,
20 etcetera, one of the proposed variances is with
21 regard to impervious surfaces, so I think if
22 you were to refer this to the Zoning Board, you
23 could ask them to ask the applicant to try to
24 minimize the impervious surface to the maximum
25 extent possible because that’s what they’re
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2 that we have to get this done by, so we’re just
3 to -- again, all these issues we’re going to
4 address with you, it’s just a question of
5 hopefully we can get a Negative Declaration
6 this evening to at least allow us to proceed to
7 the Zoning Board knowing that we have to come
8 back and address these site plan elements with
9 you.
10 While we were discussing also, I was
11 checking with my client, we were texting back
12 and forth just to get some answers. With
13 respect to the truck, and again, we’ll confirm
14 this, but my understanding is that the salt
15 truck that they use is the same truck.
16 Sometimes they use less quantity, sometimes
17 more, but my understanding is the salt
18 truck going to be the same type of truck. Again, I’m
19 going to have to confirm that because that’s
20 something I received via text, but I would have
21 to confirm it, but that’s what the client is
22 telling me who knows the protocols with the
23 trucks. So the size of the truck is the same
24 regardless. They load it depending on the
25 capacity with respect to the facility that they
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produce anything useful for us. If, as I
suspect, there is another truck, a smaller
track, 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 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

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

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. NEMECZEK: Please, if you were in
any danger, leave right now. It's not that
important.
MR. SCIARETTA: To your point, Mr.
Nemecke, 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
18 to get some answers for you right now, but,
again, we'll confirm that. Again, it's just a
20 question of trips, whether it's 12, 6 or
21 whatever the number is, we'll look into that
22 and we'll definitely obviously discuss it.
23
My point is simply, going back, again,
24 these are hopefully it would seem to be site
25 element issues that we can address as we go.
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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 button.
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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 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.
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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 it compared to this facility, but it does have a similar system that we are putting in.
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?

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?
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2 make it short and sweet. Margaret did a great
3 introduction for me. As she said, we're just
4 looking for another approval or, I guess,
5 reapproving what was already approved. We did
6 receive ARB approval back in February for this
7 project the second time. Now we're here before
8 you just to kind of remind you what the project
9 was, refresh your memory, and then answer any
10 questions that I can.
11 I'm going to share my screen and just
12 kind of walk through the plans just very
13 quickly as far as the elevations go, the
14 renderings. You might be able to see them over
15 my shoulder. I figured it might make it a
16 little bit easier, but it's a little difficult
17 to see. I'm going to share my screen now and
18 I'll walk you through it. Please ask me
19 question as you want. I'm going to go pretty
20 quickly. I don't want to keep you here too
21 long, but I'm going anywhere. I apologize, I'm
22 new to this. I got the hang of it, I'm pretty
23 good, but I just want to make sure I can show
24 you what needs to be shown.
25 So the project is a full lot
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2 subdivision off of Water Street just north --
3 I'm sorry -- of Stewart, so it's just north of
4 Stewart in the orientation that this drawing is
5 showing. The road is now known as Rogliano
6 Way. The houses had received numbers. We were
7 numbering them 1, 2, 3, 4 basically coming
8 around the cul-de-sac in a clockwise fashion,
9 but they've been numbered 1, 3, 5 and 7. So
10 the project you're looking at right here is
11 number 1. Basically this lot is two and a half
12 times what is normally required in an R-5 zone,
13 just to kind of put it in perspective and
14 remind you of where we're at.
15 I'm going to quickly just go through,
16 again, the elevations, and any questions that
17 you might have, please ask. This house is two
18 and a half stories. The garage enters from the
19 left-hand side of this front elevation. If you
20 look over at that elevation right there, that's
21 coming off of Water Street. The intention is
22 to use the grade change in the elevations to be
23 able to get in and out of the project very
24 easily without having to add a bunch more
25 impervious surface driveways, retaining walls,
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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.
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yours -- 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 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

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 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 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

yours 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.
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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
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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
DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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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
d 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
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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
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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
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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
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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
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2 members, Chairman. Nice to see everybody
3 again. My name is Adamo Maioran0 from
4 Community Designs and Engineering. We are
5 proposing additions and alterations to 100
6 Johnson Road. I'm going to share my screen so
7 you could see it in the back.
8
9 MR. CUNNINGHAM: I like your
10 background.
11
12 MR. MAIORANO: Thank you. Can you see
13 the screen?
14
15 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.
16
17 MR. MAIORANO: Okay. As I was saying,
18 the house, 100 Johnson Road, as it exists today
19 is situated on the front right corner of the
20 lot, it's in an R-5 zoning district. It may be
21 considered almost like a tiny home. It's
22 around 800 square feet. What we are proposing
23 essentially in the front is an attached one car
24 garage with a room above, that's basically a
25 dormer, and the bulk of the addition will take
26 place in the rear of the residence. It will be
27 a two story addition towards the rear with a
28 proposed deck off of the first floor. The
29 property slopes down, so with the grade change
30 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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2 new architectural asphalt shingle roof that's a
3 charcoal color, and the black railing and the
4 deck in the back is a PVC railing which will
5 pick up the accent of the black as well with
6 the white.
7
8 Now as far as the lighting is
9 concerned, we're going to have typical sconce
10 lighting on the front door, barn style lighting
11 on the garage door, as well as the back door as
12 well, and the basement, and then soffit light
13 in the first floor door into the deck in the
14 rear.
15
16 THE CHAIRMAN: Before you move on, is
17 the stone at the water table different than the
18 stone on the --
19
20 MR. MAIORANO: It's all going to
21 match. It's the same stone.
22
23 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you zoom in?
24
25 MR. MAIORANO: Yes. That's the
26 natural sort of pattern color. If you see it
27 today, it does look like it has some stone
28 on -- actually, I'll go to the pictures. The
29 existing stone is going to be removed because
30 it's just a stucco fake stone veneer. You
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2 the back basement today it does have a walkout
3 basement, but we'll be extending that basement
4 and create another walkout basement to the
5 patio area in the rear, along with some site
6 alterations extending the driveway in the front
7 as well for two car access.
8
9 I'm going to go to the elevations. So
10 as I was mentioning, the house is going to
11 receive all new finishes throughout. The
12 siding will be white HardiePlank siding. The
13 stone, what you see there today if you could
14 see from the pictures, it's actually a stuccoed
15 stone, so we're going to removing that, putting
16 in new real thin stone veneer on the front
17 right side of the first floor and a water table
18 along the garage, along with AZEK white
19 soffits, finishes, trim. The front door and
20 the garage door will be as depicted, they will
21 be black doors to match the accent of the
22 Andersen black windows, as well as the
23 simulated divided light, they'll be as what is
24 shown in the elevation, the four over one
25 pattern. The rest of the house will have the
26 same finishes throughout. The roof will be a
27 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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2 could sort of see it in maybe in that picture
3 there. It's fake stone. It's actually not
4 stone, it's stucco. It's going to be removed
5 and we're going to put the same stone on the
6 front and the garage water table. Also, you
7 see in that picture the front portico. We're
8 going to switch that up. It's sort of enclosed
9 there, so we're going to renovate that and make
10 it more of a true open portico with columns and
11 a similar roof to match the gable that we're
12 proposing above the garage.
13
14 THE CHAIRMAN: Looks very good.
15
16 MR. MAIORANO: Just basically in the
17 street-scape, it sort of also gives it more of
18 a -- the house as it is today kind of stands
19 out, and the addition will kind of help tie it
20 in with the neighborhood with the garage and
21 the addition similar to the neighboring
22 residences, as you can see throughout the
23 neighborhood. It sort of helps it blend in
24 so-to-speak.
25
26 That's pretty much it in a nutshell.
27
28 Just site features. The proposed new
29 condensers will just be located in the rear
30 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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2. underneath the deck, the proposed deck.
3. Site drainage. We'll be doing new
4. site drainage per the added impervious area
5. with Cultec units in the rear and front to tie
6. into the new driveway and the front portion of
7. the house as well.
9. Thank you. Comments?
10. (No comments.)
11. THE CHAIRMAN: So, Margaret, are there
12. any comments about the drainage that have to be
13. made or it works?
14. MS. UHLE: No. For new construction,
15. we have Joe Cermele look at that. For
16. additions and alterations, we review that
17. in-house, but that's always a requirement. So
18. our plan reviewer ensures that the storm water
19. management is being handled properly.
20. THE CHAIRMAN: So then I'll open the
21. public hearing. I make a motion to open the
22. public hearing on Application 20-10, 100
23. Johnson Road.
24. MR. NEMECEK: Second.
25. THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
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2. (Aye)
3. MR. TUDISCO: I don't see anyone
4. raising their hand at this time to offer a
5. comment. If anyone does, please raise your
6. hand and I'll invite you to un-mute yourself.
7. THE CHAIRMAN: It's the last applicant
8. and Mr. King?
9. MS. UHLE: That's right.
10. THE CHAIRMAN: So then I make a motion
11. to close the public hearing on Application
12. 20-10, 100 Johnson Road.
13. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Second.
14. THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
15. (Aye)
16. THE CHAIRMAN: I think it's so well
17. done, that even if we had more time, I wouldn't
18. have anything to say.
19. MR. NEMECEK: I just wanted to add as
20. a compliment, that the photograph of the house
21. that is showing on the screen here looks like
22. something is missing from it, and you've
23. supplied that missing piece. It looks off
24. balance. It's towards the edge of the
25. property, and by adding the garage and the
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2. space above it, the second floor, it actually
3. looks like you filled out the house to what
4. it's supposed to look like.
5. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Great looking house.
6. MR. CAMPANA: I think it was
7. successful and also in keeping with the
8. neighborhood in terms of the massing and width
9. of the homes on the side and across the side.
10. MR. MAIORANO: We created more of a
11. roof in the front of the addition, so it's not
12. a big scale home.
13. MR. NEMECEK: Thank you for the
14. presentation as well showing the street-scape
15. on it. That's quite helpful for our analysis.
16. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We're a
17. tough crowd. Have a good night. Thank you.
18. MR. MAIORANO: Thank you, everybody.
20. THE CHAIRMAN: Last application is
21. 20-14, 95 Parkway Circle.
22. MR. CUNNINGHAM: We closed the public
23. hearing, you have to approve that one?
24. MR. NEMECEK: We closed the public
25. hearing and then we commented but we didn't
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2. approve it.
3. THE CHAIRMAN: I make a motion to
4. approve Application 20-10, 100 Johnson Road.
5. MR. NEMECEK: Second.
6. THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
7. (Aye)
8. MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's what we're
9. here for.
10. MR. MAIORANO: Thank you, again. Have
11. a great summer.
12. THE CHAIRMAN: I already said what the
13. last application is, so I'll just wait.
14. MS. UHLE: He's coming.
15. MR. NEMECEK: He covered the 10:00
16. spot.
17. MR. GIZZO: Hello. Am I muted?
18. MS. UHLE: No, you're fine.
19. MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's all yours.
20. MR. GIZZO: It's all mine. Where do I
21. start? We have proposed additions and
22. alterations.
23. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Tell us who you are.
25. Property Ventures.
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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
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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
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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.

THE CHAIRMAN: 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
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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
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1. did. To hide the proposed leaders adjacent to
2. the front portico, and they recommended that
3. maybe hide them behind the columns. I don't
4. know if that was possible, but he did bring
5. them closer to the columns. Previously, they
6. came straight down sort of parallel to the
7. columns and they were more noticeable. They
8. actually asked him to consider replacing the
9. bay window on the left side of the front door
10. with just the double hung window to create a
11. little more balance, but then he chose to add
12. another bay window to create that balance.
13. That was it.
14. 
15. THE CHAIRMAN: Are they the same size,
16. those two windows, or the one on the right is
17. smaller?
18. MR. GIZZO: The one on the right is
19. actually just set back.
20. MR. CAMPANA: It looks like it's not
21. as wide, but, right, it is set back on the
22. elevation.
23. 
24. THE CHAIRMAN: So the shingles on top
25. of all of the bay windows, they all match
26. what's on the roof obviously?
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1. MR. GIZZO: Correct.
2. 
3. THE CHAIRMAN: They're not black,
4. they're the same color?
5. MR. GIZZO: Yes.
6. 
7. THE CHAIRMAN: The Hardie Board in
8. front of the gable by the front door, that's
9. the same thing, that's vertical Hardie Board?
10. MR. GIZZO: Yes.
11. 
12. THE CHAIRMAN: All right. I'm okay.
13. Anything else guys?
14. (No comments.)
15. 
16. THE CHAIRMAN: No. So I make a motion
17. to open the application on 20-14, 95 Parkway
18. Circle -- open the public hearing. All in
19. favor.
20. 
22. THE CHAIRMAN: I make a motion to open
23. the public hearing on Application 20-14, 95
24. Parkway Circle.
25. 
27. THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
28. 
29. THE CHAIRMAN: Got it that time.
30. 
31. MR. TUDISCO: Mr. Chairman, it does
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THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(Aye)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, guys. Good night.

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)
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