TOWN CLERK
EASTCHESTER, N.Y.
2019 AUG 7 AM 9:46

1

TRANSCRIPT OF

TOWN OF EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD MEETING

JUNE 27, 2019

. X

HELD AT: Eastchester Town Hall
40 Mill Road
Eastchester, New York 10709
7:00 p.m.

TOWN OF EASTCHESTER
Planning Department
AUG 02 2019
RECEIVED

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

CHAIRMAN JAMES BONANNO
PHILIP NEMECEK, MEMBER
MARK CUNNINGHAM, MEMBER
BILL WEST, MEMBER

EASTCHESTER EMPLOYEES IN ATTENDANCE:

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

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

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening. This is the Town of Eastchester Planning Board meeting of June 27, 2019. If everyone would rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was said.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to take attendance. Mr. Phil Nemecek.

MR. NEMECEK: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Jim Bonanno is present. Bill West.

MR. WEST: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mark Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robert Pulaski could not be here tonight. I'm just going to quickly run through the applications so everyone knows.

The first one is going to be 249 Main Street, the next is 51 Orchard Street, followed by the Applestone Meat Company at 735 White Plains Road, 24 Shady Lane follows that, and finally 118 Siwanoy Boulevard.

We're going to start with the first

one, which is Main Street.

MS. UHLE: Can you also mention the two that have been adjourned just in case anyone is here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good point. Sure. The two which have been adjourned is Meat the Greek at 2 Mill Road, and the second is Kid's Corner at 189 Brook.

MS. UHLE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're welcome.

MR. AGOVINO: How are you doing? My name is Angelo Agovino. I'm the owner and developer of this project.

I'm here seeking your approval to build a 15 family apartment building. We have parking spaces in the building and outside the building. We have 15 total; 12 inside -- there's 12 enclosed and 14 outside.

MR. NEMECEK: Is the terminology 15 family or 15 unit?

MR. AGOVINO: 15 unit. I apologize. This is the proposed basement here. We have some storage. We have a gym, elevator, meter room. We have a trash room. I want to keep

the trash inside the building. We're going to have a compactor down here. We're going to have a temperature control unit so it doesn't smell, and then once a week we'll take out the garbage or twice a week.

Here is the lobby. We have a meeting room here. Again, showing the parking spots inside the building. We have two stairwells, elevator, and the trash room.

Here's the typical floor. Three floors. We have two two bedroom units on each floor, and then we have three one bedroom units on each floor.

Here's the roof. This is the front of the building. I'm proposing to put some balconies, Romeo an Juliette balconies. Some of them are actually walkout. A few of them are Romeo and Juliette.

Here's the rear of the structure. Side.

MR. NEMECEK: Mr. Agovino, I know you were before this board about two months for a preliminary introduction, and I know you went over a number of the same items. Just to cut

to the quick for the members of the board here, are there any substantial revisions that you made between April and now?

MR. AGOVINO: The only thing is that we made the handicapped spot compliant. Jay said it wasn't complaint, so we made it compliant, and that's about it. We did the street-scape that you required.

MS. UHLE: As Mr. Agovino said, since this is the public hearing, even though the board heard some of this, it was at the end of a very long meeting and this is a way to introduce it to the public as well.

MR. NEMECEK: I fully understand. I'm just trying, for my own edification, what's different, if anything? Is there anything significantly different? It does look a lot like the preliminary plan, which is fine.

MR. AGOVINO: This is all we pretty much added to the plan that you had seen. This is the firehouse here. This is one of the neighboring houses. There are large buildings as you continue down the street and also to the north.

MR. NEMECEK: New Street?

MR. AGOVINO: New Street is actually directly behind it.

MR. NEMECEK: But I think the apartments, the New Street apartments that are just to the north.

MR. AGOVINO: The ones to the north, it's actually both. It's a pass through. It's on New Street and Main Street. It's a fairly large building, over a hundred units there.

MR. NEMECEK: We have, I believe, the Elide House, age restricted 55 and over housing is just opening up now, I think.

MS. UHLE: They were issued a CO in May, so they've been leasing the apartments as we speak.

MR. NEMECEK: It's significant only insofar as the timing is significant, to me at least, insofar as there are quite a number of units there that aren't fully occupied yet. So I would think that there's going to be more traffic, foot traffic, vehicular traffic and alike, once that building becomes fully occupied.

MR. AGOVINO: This is just an opinion, but I think a home like that they're not going to have cars. I think it's just going to be visitors.

MR. NEMECEK: Are you saying when you're 55, you're going to give up your car?

MR. AGOVINO: I think some go there to retire. Sorry.

MR. NEMECEK: I think 55 is the minimum. I think we were told that the more typical age is --

MS. UHLE: It's going to be significantly older, yes. That said, I'm all for people who are capable of driving, driving as long as they can.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have other consultants that are prepared at this meeting?

MR. AGOVINO: I do. We did a traffic study.

MS. UHLE: I was going to say, maybe before we move on, actually could you go back to the site plan a little bit, unless your traffic engineer is going to discuss this, I know it looks self-evident, the entrance, the

access where people park, you had said it was enclosed parking, I don't think it's technically enclosed. Also, we were talking about the elevations, maybe talk a little bit about the proposed materials as well.

MR. AGOVINO: Sure. So we have a one way driveway coming in. This is the closed in. We have a parking spot here. We have the other parking spots here. Then we have, I guess, the covered parking spots. They're going to be on all three sides of the building besides the front. We have some vegetation all around the project in the front and sides. We tried to put as much as possible.

MS. UHLE: Actually, while you're on that sheet, there are three area variances that are required. Actually, this section of the zoning law, unfortunately, is not very specific, but it does talk about requiring perimeter landscaping around all parking areas. So if you see the areas on the north and south side where there's no landscaping, they're not proposing anything there because they want to meet the backup aisle width. So it does not

meet the perimeter landscaping requirements.

Then there's a requirement that you have a certain amount of landscaping for the interior of the parking lot, and they don't meet that. That actually talks about off-street parking, and this is a little bit of a judgment call because they do have parking under the building, but it's still I think surface parking, it's not within an enclosed garage. So they're not meeting the interior landscaping requirements.

The third one is, you're required to have a space to deal with snow removal. I think they have other alternatives for dealing with snow, but I just wanted to point out on the site plan the variances that would be required.

Anyway, go ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN: The materials.

MR. AGOVINO: I'm proposing brick and Hardie Board finish on the building. This is what I want to do Hardie Board. I want to do some kind of color variations.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: This is a cast in

place concrete structure?

MR. AGOVINO: No.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: What is the structure? In the plan, you have the symbol for concrete.

MR. AGOVINO: I guess what you would call the lobby and the parking area, we're going to do poured concrete. The second, third, and fourth floor, I'm looking to do frame construction.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Like cage metal framing, like that?

MR. AGOVINO: Wood framing.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Wood framing?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Decks and walls?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes. So the common area is probably going to be out of masonry, which will be the hallways, the stairs. The apartments, the floors would be constructed out of wood material.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Engineered lumbar?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes, like TJI.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The core of the

building is concrete or block?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes. We're proposing wrought iron railings for the balconies, you know, Juliette, they're just going to be screwed on, and we're going to have some protruding out I believe. Let me give you the correct information. So only the front units have walkout balconies. So facing the front of the structure, you would be able to walk out on it. The other balconies would be Juliette balconies. We're just going to screw the railing to the structure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you go back to the side elevations?

MR. AGOVINO: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: So there's lights. Those are indicated as lights?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: They go all the way around?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's the only lights at the ground floor, those mounted on the building; correct?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes. That we're proposing, yes. A few in the front of the structure as well, on the side, and in the back.

THE CHAIRMAN: So what color are the balconies? It matches the top at the parapet? The balconies, the color shown there looks sort of greenish from here and the same thing at the parapet at the top of the building; they match?

MR. AGOVINO: I did a color printing, the architect did.

THE CHAIRMAN: What color is it?

MR. AGOVINO: Right now I'm not sure the color that we want to pick. I do want to do -- by changing the colors in the drawing, I do want to do different colors in those spots. That's why we indicated -- on your plan, it's black and white, it's a little lighter and a little darker. I wanted it to really pop out to show you guys the different color scheme. It's not going to actually be green.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you come back, we'll have a better idea of that?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: So it's basically brick veneer on those columns and EIFS product?

MR. AGOVINO: Hardie and brick.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Oh, HardiePlank?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But what's the tan? The big field of everything, what's that?

MR. AGOVINO: This is supposed to be a trim material and this is going to be Hardie.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's Hardie also. Gotcha. I understand.

MR. AGOVINO: Probably going to be use like a Boral trim. I don't know if you guys ever -- I didn't bring a sample with me. Boral is made from fire ash. It's a composite material that lasts forever. You have a hundred year warranty. It's great. It's like AZEK. It doesn't expand and contract. It's a better material.

MS. UHLE: Just remember, once you complete the SEQRA review process, then it would -- if it gets variances -- it goes to the ARB, and then it comes back to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: This will be developed

more at that time?

MS. UHLE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm okay with that. If you want to move to your consultants. Could we hear from the traffic consultant so he can explain the circulation?

MR. HOLT: Good evening. Carlito Holt with Provident Design Engineering, project manager for the project.

We prepared a traffic and parking analysis dated May 6th for the project. The key findings in that with respect to traffic is during any of the peak hours, either the peak AM, peak PM, or peak Saturday roadway hour, the proposed project isn't going to generate more than seven total trips in and out, which is a very nominal amount when you consider a use as a traffic generator. You're talking about one trip in and out every 10 minutes, and that's during the peak hours. During the rest of the day, it would be even lower.

With respect to parking, the parking that's being provided, the off street parking that is being provided is fully compliant with

the town code. However, we also checked the parking generation rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, and that indicates that the proposed use would actually not need more than 20 parking spaces. So it's even less than what the town code requires. As far as off-street parking goes, it's fully complaint. But also from an industry standard standpoint, it's got more than adequate parking to meet the peak parking demand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is visitor parking? Visitor parking would have to be street parking or are there spots?

MR. HOLT: I mean, that would be an operational issue. Typically, with these types of facilities, you would have one unit or one space per unit, and then I think residents would be able to purchase an additional space with the unit.

THE CHAIRMAN: So how many parking spaces are there?

MR. HOLT: 26 total.

THE CHAIRMAN: And there's 21 units?

MR. HOLT: 15 units.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. UHLE: Actually, the zoning law anticipates the required parking for the site as a whole, which would include visitor parking too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I imagine, as you said, all 26 could be offered up to rent by the tenants, right, because nothing is designated as visitor? All visitors could end up parking on the street by the end of the day; right?

MS. UHLE: You could require that some be designated as visitor.

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll discuss that.

MS. UHLE: Again, the zoning law requires a certain amount for multifamily buildings, but that's not saying that a certain amount has to be designated for each unit. It's anticipating total.

MR. HOLT: I would say both the code and the Institute of Transportation Engineers considers visitor parking in the number, and, like I said, the ITE rates are saying 20 spaces would be needed during the peak parking demand,

which would be a mix of residents and visitors.

MR. NEMECEK: Do you know whether each unit is going to have a or come with a parking space, or are parking spaces for lease, for example?

MR. AGOVINO: As of right now, I'm not going to designate any spots. But if it becomes an issue going forward, you know, I can designate spots for each apartment if need be. There's a lot of spots here. I don't think that -- based off of the engineers -- I don't you think there is going to be an issue. If I see an issue, we would handle it.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that's the traffic study.

As far as circulation, who studies that? Circulation, turning, parking, backing, all of that, that's your site engineering?

MR. AGOVINO: Architect.

MR. HOLT: We give a general review as part of our traffic study on the circulation, and I think, you know, the circulation is adequate for how it lays out with the one way circulation around. These spaces have plenty

of space to pull in and back out of the space, as well as the terrace parking. It has the same access. Obviously, these spaces are accessed from the exterior of the building. So I would say from a circulation standpoint, it's a pretty clean site, especially with the one way circulation.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're saying the architect is responsible for turning radiuses and pulling in and out of the space? I'm sorry, were you able to hear me?

MR. AGOVINO: It's a requirement by the Eastchester code, the backup space.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's been studied?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not by this gentleman?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Emergency vehicles?

MR. AGOVINO: My architect didn't design that.

MS. UHLE: With regard to a couple of things, the town will retain a traffic engineer. We use John Collins Engineer -- well, it's not John Collins anymore -- Maser Engineering, and usually Phil Greeley to review

the traffic study. We'll get him on board. I think we have representatives from the Fire Department here right now this evening. One of the representatives from the Fire Department has looked at the plans in a preliminary fashion just to get an understanding of it, as has the Police Department and Highway Department. We will probably have a full staff meeting along with the applicant to look at some things. So that again will be prior to the September meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: So I think we're done with the traffic for now. Thank you. Any other consultants that you brought along?

MR. AGOVINO: I do have my engineer here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Civil or --

MR. AGOVINO: Yes, civil.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. STEIN: Yes, good evening, Michael Stein, President of Hudson Engineering.

About two months ago when we were here, I also presented going through the storm water management that we had submitted.

Basically we performed percolation testing and deep hole testing at various points throughout the site. Just based upon the setback to the building, the setback to the property lines, we felt it would be appropriate to put any infiltration along the sides of the building. Based upon the percolation rates we observed at the rear of the building, that really was the ideal place for it.

Based upon the depth, we adjusted the type of system based upon the clearances to the ledge rock that we encountered. So it's actually a very shallow system. It's about a 6 inch high system, that's why it's so spread out. We didn't have a lot of volume to store, so by adding more area for infiltration, it improved the capacity of the system. So we're fully infiltrating all the runoff coming from the roof, from the driveway, from all the impervious areas from the site.

My understanding is, it's in the process of being reviewed by Kellard Sessions.

THE CHAIRMAN: We trust that will be reviewed and that it's designed adequately.

Perfect. Thank you.

MS. UHLE: They also submitted an analysis of the number of school children that will be potentially generated, so I think the planner is here as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, really?

MS. UHLE: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. For the record, David Smith, Principal of Planning & Development Advisors.

We've submitted a report at the request of the Planning Director, that would evaluate the potential for school age children. The basis for the analysis is -- it's an industry standard evaluation based on the Rutger's University Listokin and Burchell modeling, and it's based on a survey of the number of multifamily developments based on unit type, whether it's ownership or rental, based on the number of units in the building, and then also based on the rental rates or the purchase rate of a particular unit. Our evaluation, which is included in the report,

estimates that on the conservative side you'll probably have two public school age children as a result of the proposed project, given that most of the units are one bedroom units. These types of units typically don't -- if you have a family, as you all know, if you have small kids, it's fine, but then once they start to get of school age, you typically have a family that wants to move out, find a single family home, and most times the rental rate is comparable, to some extent, with a mortgage. So families are typically looking to move to a different type of residence.

The information in the report is supported in part on my experience in part in two different communities. I know they're completely different from an economic and socioeconomic standpoint. One is in the Village of Port Chester where we had more than 200 units surveyed by the school district, and they generated very few school age children, public school age children. The other is in the City of White Plains which monitors the multifamily developments in that community, and

they evaluate the number of public school age kids from those projects. In both cases, those numbers, accurate survey numbers, are less than what is projected in the Listokin and Burchell. So that's why we feel that the evaluation that we prepared is conservative in nature.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the number of school children anticipated for rental units a function of the size of the units being rented, as in one bedroom, two bedroom, three bedroom?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the mix of the two that you referenced similar to this? I would imagine if you have a lot of three bedroom units, you're going to have more children. If you have only singles, you're not going to have children.

MR. SMITH: Correct. Right. Typically, you'll have less children with a one bedroom.

THE CHAIRMAN: My question is, is the mix on those the same as here as far as the proportion of --

MR. SMITH: In the other communities?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. You're bringing up the other units as an example of this, I'm not quite sure how comparable the mix is.

MR. SMITH: In White Plains, they take the aggregate of all. That includes studios and ones and twos. In Port Chester it was the same thing, studios, ones and twos.

THE CHAIRMAN: Studios, ones and twos, and that's what we have here?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. NEMECEK: Is there a reason that you used Port Chester and White Plains; was that just the data that you had available? Were there other towns maybe more similar to Eastchester for which data was available of this sort?

MR. SMITH: The reason was, I had active projects in both of those communities, and both of those communities had the same concern, you know, how many school age kids. So we had to do an evaluation. We could rely on or contact the Eastchester School District to find out from new developments what they're generating. I know with the project in

Tuckahoe across from the train station, the new one --

MR. NEMECEK: The one down at Crestwood?

MR. SMITH: Crestwood, yes. The same issues were raised as part of that project, and they had to do an evaluation of school age kids coming from different multifamily developments. I know that that information was available. I didn't access it, but I could certainly request it.

MR. NEMECEK: If you could do that as this process goes on. Hopefully corroborate your estimates here.

MR. SMITH: I'm pretty sure that it will, yes. We could do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't there also a multifamily on -- we've done a couple; right? There's one on Maple and there's one on --

MS. UHLE: We have a 10 unit on Maple Street and --

THE CHAIRMAN: One on --

MS. UHLE: There is one on Brook Street. You actually throughout the years had

a couple of studies and analyses done. I think were done by John Meyer Consulting, who probably did the one for the Crestwood building. I think we even had them do a similar analysis even for the senior housing ones, knowing that those were for senior housing but kind of comparing. So I think that information is probably available.

MR. SMITH: So if we may coordinate with Margaret and her office.

MR. NEMECEK: I think it's called the Avenue at Crestwood.

MS. UHLE: I don't remember.

MR. NEMECEK: I think that's the name of it. It's the one down by the Crestwood Train Station.

MS. UHLE: You just want to try to get some more local data.

MR. NEMECEK: Yes. As long as the data doesn't complete skew much higher. If it did, I would kind of want to know why. It seems to make sense. The criteria that you applied was a sort of a mix. I know you said it's mostly single bedroom units, but it's nine

and six, so it does have six two bedroom units as well. Also, the fact that it's a rental, the price point, those are all things that factor in it, but it makes sense. The more data we have, I guess the more comfort that we have that the information -- that your estimates are likely to fall right in the range of what actually happens.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Understood.

MS. UHLE: I think sometimes people get confused that it's school age children. So you may have zero to four year olds in there.

MR. NEMECEK: Correct. People may want to move out at a certain point.

MR. SMITH: That's why we clarified that it's public school age.

MR. NEMECEK: Exactly. That's good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wrote a couple of notes down. Although you're going to be back a lot of times, I'm not trying to make you forget them by the time you're back. If you could just ask your architect on the next pass

he does, to put in the unit mix on the plans somewhere so we could count it. And then the renderings that you brought up, I'm sure he's going to embellish them as he goes along with cleaner and nicer renderings. Right now it certainly suffices.

MS. UHLE: I'm sorry, what was your comment with regard to the renderings?

THE CHAIRMAN: Just that he shows a little more clearly that there's HardiePlank.

MS. UHLE: Okay. A little more detail. Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: We expect that he'll do that. For now it certainly served the purpose. Thank you.

This is a public hearing. Let me just see if there are any comments from the public and then we'll continue. It's open already; right?

MR. NEMECEK: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not open?

MS. UHLE: No, it's not.

MR. NEMECEK: It was just a preliminary hearing last time.

THE CHAIRMAN: So then I make a motion to open the public hearing on Application 19-02, 249 Main Street.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, comments from the public.

MR. TWEEN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Board members. My name is Brian Tween, I'm the Eastchester Fire District Fire Chief.

We received a letter in the mail saying that there was a public meeting tonight. A few of the Commissioners had a few concerns, and they wanted me to just let the Planning Board be aware of them.

One of them is a concern of when the new building is under construction and they're doing utility work in the street, that at least one lane on Main Street would be maintained open because that's our main access route to Tuckahoe and Bronxville and the south end of Eastchester like the Chester Heights area, so

that they wouldn't close the street and make us go a circuitous way to respond. It doesn't just affect the Fire Department, EVAC's headquarters is right next to us. So it would affect fire and ambulance response time.

Also, in front of the proposed building, there are currently three Fire Department visitor parking spaces un-metered. There's a sign that says, Fire Department parking only. Our employees park in our driveway. We have a treasurer, a secretary, and sometimes myself park in the three spots in front of fire headquarters on our property in the driveway, but there are spots for visitors who come to do business, either the public or, you know, vendors use those spots, and they're literally right in front. Where their driveway ends, they're just to the south of where their driveway curb cut is. So with them having an in and an out, are we going to lose all three spots, are we going to lose one spot? If we could keep as many spots as possible so visitors would be able to use those. I've been with the Fire Department for over 30 years

between a volunteer and career and they've always been there. I don't know when they were put there, but they've been there for a very long time.

Also, the height of the building, I assume four stories is going to be more than 30 feet, so the Fire Inspector, as Margaret said, he did review preliminary plans awhile back, so they either need to put in an aerial fire apparatus access road, which I believe has to be 26 feet wide to give us access for our ladders to be able to reach the roof of the building, or they have to remove the wires, either bury them or put them on the other side of the street. I realize that goes through the plans and my Fire Inspector will, you know, comment more on that as we have meetings, and I'm sure Margaret has spoken to them. That was our concern as well, that the wires that go in front of the building will block our ladders to be able to access the new building, whether to make a rescue to a window or to access the roof for fire.

So those are my three comments. Thank

you for your consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't go yet. As far as aerial access, the truck remains on the street, it can't possibly pull in; right?

MR. TWEEN: With the wires there, they can't. Main Street would be the access road. So if that's the access road, there can't be wires between the access road and the building.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the access would only be on the street side; right?

MR. TWEEN: If they wanted to make a driveway that met the requirements. I don't know that their driveway is 26 feet wide. I don't know what it is. I believe the fire access road has to be a minimum un-obstructed width of 26 feet. I saw one of the Board members shaking their head that it's not going to meet that. So I would assume that Main Street is going to be the fire access road.

MS. UHLE: I believe in talking to Captain Pintavalle, and I certainly don't want to speak for the Fire Department, they're going to review this more thoroughly -- I believe when he did his preliminary review, he

indicated that the fire vehicles would not be coming on site, that they would be stationed on Main Street. He also did mention to us and we mentioned to the applicant, that the overhead wires would be an issue and that those would need to be relocated or put underground.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the wires. I'm just saying, your department has made the evaluation that they could fight fires from the street and don't need access within the parking lot?

MR. TWEEN: Yes.

MR. NEMECEK: You mentioned at the very beginning, that you had spoken to the commissions; who are you talking about there?

MR. TWEEN: So the Eastchester Fire District is overseen by a board of fire commissioners. Chairman Stewart Rabin and Commissioner Tom Roche are in the audience tonight. It's a board of five fire commissioners. They had a meeting about a week or 10 days ago, and we had just received a letter that day that there was going to be a public hearing, so at that point at their

meeting they expressed some concerns and wanted myself and a few commissioners to attend tonight's meeting.

MR. NEMECEK: I have question. I don't know if it's for you, Chief Tween or for Margaret or for Rob. Chief Tween is here, he obviously is an official in the Town of Eastchester, and I think we regular confer with the Eastchester Fire Department on issues involving our applications. I know he's speaking at the public hearing, but is he considered a member of the public or a member of the town government sort of?

MS. UHLE: He's considered the Fire Chief. Actually, the Fire District is not part of the town government; correct?

MR. TWEEN: Yes. It's separate.

MS. UHLE: I think it's appropriate for him to speak as the Fire Chief about the fire related issues.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's really no different than if you put it in writing and sent it to us.

MR. TUDISCO: In fact, there are many

applications where we will say we would like the Fire Department to review and address their concerns. Having them here to address them and discuss with the Board actually is helpful.

MR. NEMECEK: I have no problem at all with your getting up. I'm just wondering, if we close the public hearing, couldn't we also call the Fire Department if we had an issue that came up; right?

MS. UHLE: Well, technically, whether it's the Fire Department or not, once you close the public hearing, you're not permitted to get additional information. You would keep the public hearing open until you have information from everyone. There is a little bit different circumstances here because not only is the Fire Department giving their view on the fire access issues, they're immediately adjacent.

As in a side, one thing that you may not have noticed in your package that is just something of note, is that --

MR. NEMECEK: The historical nature of the building?

MS. UHLE: As part of the SEQRA

process under certain circumstances you contact SHPO, the State Historic Preservation Office, and they said the site was not of any particular interest but actually the fire station itself is a historic building and has historic interest.

MR. NEMECEK: It was described as being potentially protected because it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a time period or method of construction, etcetera.

MS. UHLE: They're only protected if you asked to be listed, but it is interesting it has a historic character.

MR. TUDISCO: I guess the short answer to your question is, both, an official capacity and as a neighbor.

MR. NEMECEK: Okay. Good.

THE CHAIRMAN: So where are the Fire Department spots; can you just point them out?

MR. TWEEN: Yes. There's a telephone pole just past where their curb cut for their current driveway starts, and so I believe there's a sign on that, and then to the next driveway there's another telephone pole.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's across the front of the property.

MR. TWEEN: Yes, it's pretty much directly the whole front of the property.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Of their property.

MR. TWEEN: Yes, from driveway to driveway. The Fire Inspector would deal with the wire issue, you know, that's his purview, building codes and things like that. I just wanted to express our concerns with utility work, keeping the road open, and the parking spots.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess the question is, are the spots between the curb cuts or are they -- actually, they extend beyond the curb cuts?

MR. AGOVINO: So existing right now there is two driveways into the structure, and we are leaving the two driveways and two curb cuts. We're not changing any of that. So everything will stay existing, they'll keep the spots. So we are keeping the conforming driveways that are there now.

MR. NEMECEK: Was there anything that

Chief Tween said that is sort of a deal breaker for you, that you can't work around, you can't work with the Fire Department?

MR. AGOVINO: No. We knew all this.

MR. NEMECEK: Okay. I just want to make sure that we haven't reached the point of no return yet.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There's a sprinkler system in this building. When you come off the street, the parking lot is on, really, the ground floor on the street level, you have to come up these stairs into the building to get to the sprinkler room? There's a fire command center in it?

MR. AGOVINO: Yes, I believe so. It's in the boiler room downstairs.

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't it supposed to be in the lobby?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I see there's a sprinkler room.

MR. AGOVINO: The control panel has to be in the lobby. I believe by New York State code you have to have the control panel --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You have to be able

to see it when you come in.

MR. AGOVINO: That would be just the backflow devices and where the water gets pumped up.

THE CHAIRMAN: I imagine that's all going to be addressed by the architect when he finishes the plans. We're not going to opine on what needs to be done here, although I think you're right. So that was the only question.

The other question which the Chief brought up, which is a concern to all of us, is during construction there is no impact on the operations of the firehouse. So however this is being staged, however this is being loaded, I think there's no chance that ever that street is closed. It has to be done without that. That sort of goes without saying. That will be a condition.

MR. AGOVINO: We're not allowed to close the road unless we get a permit. If we do, we would have to ask permission. We wouldn't just close the road.

MR. TUDISCO: The Fire Department is a unique building in the sense that there are

times -- Chief, correct me if I'm wrong -- where the street actually has to be closed for the vehicles to get into the garage?

MR. TWEEN: For EVAC, for the Ambulance Core and the Fire Department, there's a preemptive traffic light. So the fire trucks have like a garage door opener, they have a button in the fire trucks that they could hit that will turn the traffic light on Main Street red. Normally, it's blinking yellow. When the fire trucks or the ambulance approach, they hit the bottom in the fire truck or in the firehouse, and it will stop the traffic on Main Street so they could pull in or pull out safely.

MR. NEMECEK: It usually feels like, if you're in a car driving, it's about 35 minutes.

MR. TWEEN: We have seen a few people roll through it because they don't realize that the light is actually red because they're just so used to going straight through it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your time. Valid points. We'll keep them in mind

when we continue this process.

Any other comments from the public?

(No comments.)

THE CHAIRMAN: So we're going to leave the public hearing open. We just have to do that one little comment; is that right?

MS. UHLE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: As part of the SEQRA process, we're going to make a motion that we're going to be the lead agency. I'm going to read the motion, we're going to vote on it, and that makes us lead agency, and then we're done until September.

MS. UHLE: Actually what you're doing is you're declaring your intent to be lead agency. That's circulated to the other involved agencies. The other involved agencies are the agencies that have an approval authority. Right now that's the Zoning Board and the Health Department. So then in September if you don't hear from those agencies, which I doubt that you will, then you'll declare yourself lead agency, and then you'll be in a position to make a determination

of significance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Got that? I make a motion that the Planning Board declare its intent to be a lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed action, which has been classified as an unlisted action, and forward a Notice of Intent to all other involved agencies in accordance with the SEQRA regulations.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you're good to go, and we'll see you back here in September.

MR. AGOVINO: Back to this Board?

MS. UHLE: Yes, you're coming back to this Board because they have to finish the SEQRA process.

In the meantime, between now and September, our engineering consultant will have completed his review of the storm water management plan, our traffic engineer will complete his review of the traffic analysis, Dave Smith will provide some additional

information about the school children generation, etcetera. They need to complete the SEQRA process before they can refer you to the Zoning Board. I think you've been very good about providing a very thorough presentation, so they may be in that position in September. It really depends on the -- we're also going to meet with the Fire, Police, Highway, again, who have looked at this in a preliminary fashion and have not expressed any grave concerns, but you need to tie up some of those loose ends before it can be referred.

MR. NEMECEK: So I think what you meant to say was, I'm so happy I'm going to be coming back to the Planning Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're going to be back here a few times, so get used to us. You're going to go to Zoning and then you're coming back.

MR. AGOVINO: I thought I was going to Zoning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Immediately, no.

MS. UHLE: You're getting there.

MR. STEIN: I just have one quick

question as far as Kellard's review. We'll be able to interact back and forth so it's not just one review that we have to wait until September on?

MS. UHLE: Absolutely. Continue your review. I did mention to the Board and I mentioned to the applicant, that actually at around 4:30 this afternoon I did receive a memo from our engineering consultant, but I didn't want to confuse everybody and I hadn't had a chance to review it. Once I review it, which hopefully will be tomorrow, I'll circulate it to everyone, and then, yes, you could continue to work with them. Same thing with the traffic engineers, I don't think it's that complicated of an analysis, so we'll get Phil Greeley on board and you're welcome to coordinate directly with each other. Ideally, you would like to get here in September saying, not a problem with anything.

MR. STEIN: That's exactly what I was hoping.

MR. NEMECEK: There's not going to be a lot of wasted time between now and then.

MR. STEIN: I appreciate it.
MR. NEMECEK: Have a great summer.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Agovino. Have a nice summer.
The next application is 19-04, 51 Orchard Street.
MR. SCHLOMANN: Good evening.
THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening.
MR. SCHLOMANN: Sid Schlomann, architect, on behalf of the owners of 51 Orchard Street. This application before you is for a residential addition of an existing house at 51 Orchard Street.
Here are photos of the house. It's a one family residence on a lot, a long rectangular lot. We're in an R-6 district. It's a 15,000 square foot lot, so it's oversized for its zoning district. The proposed orientation of the addition takes advantage of the lengthy lot toward the rear.
There's an existing detached one car garage that is non-compliant. It's very close to the property line. We will be removing that entirely. We will be adding to the existing

residence with an addition and adding a two car garage detached in the rear of the house that will be fully zoning compliant. We would be extending the existing pavement, which ends here now, toward the rear to create the two car garage, and then blend the two story addition to the existing one family house.
This is an aerial view of the residence and the lot. You could see there's ample natural screening already on either side of the properties. This is the rear lot here. This is a little blurry, but you could see the detached garage there. So basically the extension would be towards the rear of the lot here. Some other residences on the street just in terms of scale.
This is a proposed rendering of the addition. So the front facade would stay the same, and the addition would be this middle portion here extending, raising the roof line, and extending to the rear addition in the back.
This is a view from the rear with the two car garage detached with a 12 foot driveway in the center, requirement for principal

structure to the detached garage, and then the addition here, the transition period, transition structure, and the existing two story home in the front. So you could see how aesthetically we've carried the materials across matching to have a cohesive -- we've taken a lot of input from the Architectural Review Board and have included it in our design, including some of the white scalloped siding here and some of the windows and doors, they had some strong opinion on.
In terms of the site itself, the extension of the pavement would maintain a 3 foot buffer to the property line, which is a town requirement. We also picked up on the rain or the storm water, all the added square footage has been an accounted for with our engineer. We had done soil testing, percolation rates, deep testing, and we designed a storm water retention system in the backyard that would capturing all the additional impervious surface.
In terms of floor plan, this is the existing first floor here, this is the middle

portion that would be extended slightly, and this would be a two story addition plus a basement in the rear, which would be a great room and upstairs would be three bedrooms. So the existing house has bedrooms in the front here, and then we would be adding a few bedrooms in the rear.
We feel in terms of appropriateness for the neighborhood, there are a few houses in the neighborhood of varying scale and bulk, and we feel that we maintained the front facade in a quaint way and our bulk goes towards the rear. Some of the houses on the street are varying sizes, some are a lot bigger. Theirs is a multifamily complex in the rear. Let me put up a little bit of the street-scape or photos. The neighborhood and street is a blend of houses. This is in the rear yard. There's a multifamily complex there and you could see varying scales of other houses on the street.
THE CHAIRMAN: Since we love talking about materials, that's all going to be HardiePlank?
MR. SCHLOMANN: It's not. Existing is

vinyl, and we're matching it with the same exact vinyl siding. I have samples here. The roofing is a charcoal asphalt shingle and we're matching that. The white scallops. We're matching the materials so it stays cohesive from front to back.

THE CHAIRMAN: The storm water management has been prepared by --

MR. SCHLOMANN: Hudson Engineering. He's here as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: He is here. He stuck around.

MR. NEMECEK: I have a question for you. This is a very sizable addition. The addition will be significantly larger than the existing structure. I think the existing structure, the gross square footage is 1483 and you're adding almost 1900 square feet to that. You're taking out some small portion of the existing and replacing it. I know one of the concerns that the Architectural Review Board had, and I think one of the reasons that you had to come back, was that it does have something of the appearance of adding a second

house behind the first one.

MR. SCHLOMANN: That was their initial concern at our fist meeting.

MR. NEMECEK: I know you've obviously done something to soften that. The floor plan, is it still going to have -- how many kitchens are there?

MR. SCHLOMANN: One kitchen. There's one kitchen.

MS. UHLE: Again, a two family house is not permitted there, and I know that that's not what is at all intended by the applicant. Honestly, the Planning Board and the ARB can't really speculate about that type of thing. I think what the ARB's biggest concern was, was not the implication that it may be two families but that it looked like two separate families. They did ask the applicant to come up with a more cohesive design so it read as a one family house.

MR. NEMECEK: And I think the ARB did approve this design; correct?

MS. UHLE: Yes.

MR. NEMECEK: Okay. Fair enough.

MR. SCHLOMANN: Would you like the engineer?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, let's see what he's got.

MR. STEIN: Good evening, again. Michael Stein with Hudson Engineering.

So we started off again by the first thing is doing our field testing. We had locations where percolation in the back was really fantastic, 11 inches over 11 inches per hour for our percolation rates. So we're directing all the new impervious surface back to the new infiltration system. We have seven CULTECs going in that fully infiltrate all the runoff from the proposed impervious surfaces. I believe we even designed up to the hundred year storm. With the fantastic percolation rate, we just took advantage of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You seem very happy.

MR. STEIN: Always.

THE CHAIRMAN: As opposed to other places where it's not and it's much more difficult. Okay. Thank you.

Are there any other comments about

that, that we have to review?

MS. UHLE: No. This is also being reviewed by Kellard Sessions. Unlike a couple of the prior applications, I don't think there's any concern about, you know, issues. So it's just a matter of the engineers coordinating to wrap up the loose ends.

MR. NEMECEK: So your far enough along that you're confident that if we were to approve it with the condition that all the loose ends be tied up --

MS. UHLE: Yes. In all honesty, if it's a condition and the loose ends weren't tied up, they don't get an approval, but, yes.

MR. NEMECEK: Of course. Absolutely. But it's not so substantial that we wouldn't be at that phase?

MS. UHLE: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're not changing any landscaping as far as what's there, we're just adding?

MR. SCHLOMANN: Nothing major. These here are actually all existing. We're continuing the boxwoods along the perimeter of

the house. The side landscaping won't be disturbed during any excavation. Everything will kind of stay. So just really perimeter beautification around the lower portion of the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we've made our favorite comment about the location of the condensers; air conditioning condensers, where they are?

MR. SCHLOMANN: There were no comments about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are they shown on the site plan?

MR. SCHLOMANN: I don't know if they're shown. I don't think they're on the site plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are they new or existing?

MR. SCHLOMANN: Both -- actually, there is no existing central air. No. It would all be new central air conditioning.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't see them.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Are there new services coming into this house for electric or

gas?

MR. SCHLOMANN: No. It's all the existing services; sewer, water, electric.

MS. UHLE: One thing with this plan, even though they're not showing the location, because it's such an oversized lot -- technically those units are allowed to be within 5 feet of the property line. They sort of have lots of potential locations for those that would not be disruptive to the neighbors and that would meet zoning requirements.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That being said, we'll go with that.

This is a public hearing, so let's just see if there are any comments from the public, and then we'll come back to you. So I make a motion to open the public hearing on Application 19-04, 51 Orchard Street.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Comments? Please.

MR. PARISI: Good evening. My name is Paul Parisi, I live at 55 Orchard Street, which

is the property just east of this property.

This plan has been before the Architectural Review Board, and it was noted there, as this body has just noted, that what you're looking at is not an addition to an existing one family house, you're seeing an additional house being tried to be constructed on this property. They mitigated it. There was just a small little bit of a breezeway between the two houses. Now they've enhanced that, made it a little larger. In actuality, what you're looking at is another house being built on the property. This is for two families. You're going to have grandparents living in the existing house, and you're going to have the family, the daughter living in the house to the rear.

Look at these plans very carefully, please, because what's being shown is -- this is a one family zone, you're going to have a two story house being put up here, even though they tried to mitigate it by using a breezeway.

I don't know what type of utilities are going in there yet. There was some

construction in the street. Maybe they're enhancing the water, etcetera. But looking at these plans, you could see they mitigated the breezeway, enlarged it a little bit, but you have a second house being built on this property. So please take a very close look at this and don't foist this upon the neighborhood. Thank you.

MS. UHLE: Just see if there are any other comments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other comments from the public?

MR. ALBANO: My name is Richard Albano, I'm at 47 Orchard Street, right next door. They dug up the street once with Con Ed. and put in a second gas meter. The original heat is oil heat that Mimi had. I don't know what they're up to yet, but something smells very fishy. That's all I have to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. NEMECEK: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any more comments from the public? Please.

MS. SKIPPER: Hi. My name is Katie

Skipper. What he's referring to is we just converted from oil to gas. We went through the town for the permit to remove the oil and they're putting in a gas line. There's not two meters. There might be two right now, but Con Ed is coming to remove the old one and it's just going to be gas, no, oil. The tank removal we did through the town and with the Fire Department. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. NEMECEK: Thank you.

MR. SCHLOMANN: Can I just add to some of the comments?

I think one of the reasons the family chose this site is because of its size and its ability to compliantly hold an addition of that size. Some of lots in the area are smaller or half the size or even less. So they chose this to properly, fully zoning compliant put the addition that they really wanted and to have minimal impact on the neighborhood. Both neighbors, street, visually, environmentally the impact is minimal because of that. It's fully code compliant. It is a one family

house. It is not a two family house. I just wanted to clarify that.

THE CHAIRMAN: As the gentleman said, Margaret, there's are no variances required for any of this?

MS. UHLE: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you put back up the view from the street, the street elevation?

MR. SCHLOMANN: Yes. The photo or the rendering?

THE CHAIRMAN: The rendering first. That's fine.

MR. SCHLOMANN: This is the front elevation here.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The drawing says that there's a 12 foot setback between the house structure and the --

MR. SCHLOMANN: Detached garage.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: In the rendering it looks like it's --

MR. SCHLOMANN: It's just the perspective. It would be right in here.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is going to be maintained?

MR. SCHLOMANN: The minimum requirement I think is 10 feet, and we're doing 12 feet for a little bit better maneuvering area. One of the other reasons, also, that we feel the garage placement works well, right now the one car garage is drive in and then you have to back out onto the street. It's kind of a busy street. People use it as a cut through as well. So by doing this layout, you're able to pull into the garage, and we've given a little bit of a backup -- you pull into the garage and you have a little bit of backup turning radius and then pull out. So nobody is backing out onto the street. So we feel we've alleviated a safety concern as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is the gentleman, 47 Orchard; it's further down?

MR. SCHLOMANN: It's to the right. So if we look at the aerial view, it's this house here whose property ends -- I'm sorry, this is 51. Oh, you're here? Okay. 47 is there.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's 47. What's the lot size?

MR. SCHLOMANN: It's almost

15,000 square feet where 6,000 is required in the zone.

THE CHAIRMAN: So what's the dimensions of the lot?

MR. SCHLOMANN: It is 75 across by almost 200 deep. 75 across. So the neighbor to the west is here where the greatest buffer is here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything we could do to mitigate the -- put landscaping or something against the property line?

MS. UHLE: I mean, you have a house that complies with the zoning requirements, so I'm not sure what you're mitigating. If you felt there was something to mitigate, you could mitigate it. It sounds like the concern is --

THE CHAIRMAN: The size.

MS. UHLE: Well, the size complies with zoning. I think the concern, it sounds to me, is the implication that it's actually a two family house, not a one family house. Multi-generations are permitted to live together in a home. I understand the concerns of the neighbors because we expressed that at

the ARB as well, but I just want to make clear, you can have multi-generations living in a home.

My understanding is that the reason that the -- what many people do is tear down and significantly modify the existing residence. They wanted to keep the scale and integrity of the existing residence so from the street-scape the image kind of remains the same.

I also think -- you could correct me if I'm wrong -- it's sort of a modular addition at the back?

MR. SCHLOMANN: Correct.

MS. UHLE: So for cost effectiveness and that kind of thing, it's unusual to the extent that they didn't decide to just blow out the existing house, but I also think because it's an older, historic house, there are lower ceiling heights and things like that, that would have been harder for them to expand.

It is on an oversized lot. The house does clearly meet all setback requirements, and it's within the permitted size with regard to

the gross floor area.

MR. WEST: Are there any rules about multiple kitchens, summer kitchens?

MS. UHLE: In a single family neighborhood, you can have one kitchen. You cannot have a summer kitchen either. I think the applicants are aware of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the public hearing is still open. Any more comments from the public?

(No comments.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Then I'm going to close the public hearing.

I make a motion to close the public hearing on this application 19-04, 51 orchard.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: As you said, there's no variances required, this is as of right, so there's really not much we can do. I think it's suitable that it be built.

Any other comments, gentlemen?

MR. NEMECEK: I know this went through

the ARB for a couple of meetings until it reached a point that the ARB finds it perfectly acceptable, and they have pretty good judgment on the aesthetics.

With that said, and with Margaret's points about this being completely compliant with our code, I don't have any further reservations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen?

(No comments.)

MS. UHLE: If you do approve it, it would be a condition with regard to the storm water management plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: So then we make a motion to approve the application, 19-04, 51 Orchard.

MR. NEMECEK: Subject to --

THE CHAIRMAN: Subject to the conditions of the storm water as approved by our engineer.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. SCHLOMANN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next application is 19-20, Applestone Meat, 735.

MS. ASCHER: Hi there. My name is Gail Ascher, and I represent John Cotugno Architects. We've been here -- we're back to the Planning Board. We were here last September, October, and January regarding Applestone Meat Company. The tenant was able to -- the future tenant was able to rent the adjacent space. GNC moved out. So that's why we're. We've expanded. We haven't really expanded the program but we've expanded the space, so we had to rework the facade. In terms of the Planning Board, I think that's the main thing that we're here for.

MR. TUDISCO: Bring the microphone with you, please.

MS. ASCHER: Sure. Yes. I don't have the plan that was submitted. This was one from the initial, so I colored in red to show it. This was the initial space. In the middle was the former dentist's office. This is the GNC space. This is White Plains Road. This is the

Trader Joe's parking lot. Just to show you, we're expanding into here. We're adding about 906 square feet, essentially doubling in size.

So that's the view from Route 22, and this is the view from the back. Let me see if there's a better view.

MR. NEMECEK: So you would have two of the three storefronts there.

MS. ASCHER: Yes. I don't think we're going to get the nail salon, but you never know.

So we submitted also plans and elevations to show the space. This is the new space. We're moving into other retail space, GNC was retail, there's no change of use. The only change in program is we're separating the employee activities and moving it over. So we're actually allowing this space -- in entirety it was their whole operation, now it's going to be just for customers and vending machine operations. So all the employees come in here. They haven't expanded the program at all, except the fact that they're going to have more vending machines in here.

MR. WEST: More meat prep there? I mean, what is the additional space for?

MS. ASCHER: To be more comfortable, have more vending machines.

MS. UHLE: And more office space.

MS. ASCHER: And more office space. They're not adding employees. Not initially, for sure, anyway. Actually, I think they're freeing up parking spaces because GNC was a real full retail operation during the day. I think in terms of planning, I think it's actually improving the situation. So I guess we could talk about the facade.

MR. NEMECEK: Yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There is a cellar in both units; right?

MS. ASCHER: Yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You were able to bring --

MS. ASCHER: They'll still store stuff down there.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's going to stay the same.

MS. UHLE: Technically, this is before

you only for the facade improvements. The operations are interesting, but it's really just here for the facade improvements.

MR. NEMECEK: It's grilling season. Come on, Margaret, throw us a bone.

MS. ASCHER: So what we are able to do is unify the facade. It will be much nicer than what's here now. That's one thing.

They're proposing to use a standing seam metal roofing material on the sides, so it's not actually projecting in terms of drainage. It's cleaning it up. It will be a nice gray color. This will be a white sign on the dark background. So I actually have pictures. This is what they used, so it's sort of similar that.

MR. NEMECEK: Can we get that in front of the camera so we can show our very substantial viewing audience at home.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let Gary zoom in on that.

MR. NEMECEK: Put it right there. Put it on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: There you go.

MS. UHLE: Thank you, Gary.

MR. NEMECEK: Good work, Gary.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you're saying it's going to be similar to that?

MS. ASCHER: Yes. Actually, it's the same. The pet store next door has something similar, which is kind of where they're taking this from. There's has a little projection but they have a similar standing seam, so it would tie into that.

MR. NEMECEK: Probably not a good idea that I mention pet store and meat store in the same --

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we get it. So that's the change.

MS. ASCHER: In the back, we're going to keep this locked. This is the employee entrances. One zone for entry. The same as for both sides, one in the back and front.

THE CHAIRMAN: Looking at the floor plans, there will be -- oh, I see, there would be two entrances as opposed to what we had before?

MS. ASCHER: Two more entrances, but

they're just for employees. They'll have lock and key. That's what they told me.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the public just uses the two that were there in the initial application?

MS. ASCHER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So let's see if there are comments from the public on the facade.

I make a motion to open the public hearing on Application 19-20, Applestone Meat Company, 735 White Plains Road.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: John, you good? So I'll close the public hearing. So I make a motion to close the public hearing on this application, Applestone Meat, 735 White Plains Road.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Best of luck. I think it's good. So all of the conditions --

MS. UHLE: So as part of your approval, you'll just make it clear that all of the conditions that applied to the previous approval apply, and I'll restate those in the resolution.

MS. ASCHER: The ARB was actually very positive. They really liked it, the materials.

THE CHAIRMAN: If they're happy, we're happy. Just in general.

Subject to the terms of the conditions of the previous approval, I make a motion to approve this application also, 735 White Plains Road, Applestone Meat Company.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Good job.

MR. NEMECEK: Have a good summer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have a nice summer. Do you have any idea when they're going to be coming up here? Do you know of any plans of when they're going to start work here?

MS. ASCHER: When they plan to start work?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. ASCHER: We have to do construction drawings, so I guess that would be the next step, submit for building permit.

THE CHAIRMAN: So fall?

MS. ASCHER: I would think so. I would think fall.

THE CHAIRMAN: Every time I pass by, I would expect to see them.

MS. ASCHER: I would think a couple of months realistically.

THE CHAIRMAN: This gives them more visibility on the road too. Great. Thank you.

The next Application 19-18, 24 Shady Lane.

MR. NEMECEK: Again, batting cleanup, John Iannacito.

MR. IANNACITO: Okay. Good evening. My name is John Iannacito, I'm an architect, and I'm representing Mr. and Mrs. Leone, the owners of the subject property. We are proposing an addition an alterations to the existing single family residence located at 24 Shady Lane. The proposed scope of work will

include a two story addition at the side of the existing residence, which is highlighted here on the site plan.

Just quickly go through the floor plans. On the lower floor, the addition will include an expansion of the existing garage. So we go from a one car garage to a two car garage. On the second floor, the upper floor, the addition will include a new bedroom and reconfiguration of the other two bedrooms in that space.

Here is the front elevation, existing and proposed. Here is the existing front elevation with the single garage and the proposed with the expanded addition and two car garage. The right side pretty much stays the same, it's just the addition towards the rear here. On the rear, it's just expansion of the existing facade over to the side.

Here's a rendering of the exterior showing the materials. All the new materials will match existing. Wall surfaces will be stucco to match existing. The windows will be vinyl clad to match existing. The shutters are

composite in a black finish. The overhead door will be fiberglass in a white finish. The roof shingles will be asphalt in a charcoal finish to match exist.

The project was presented to the ARB on June 6th, and they had a couple of comments. One was to show the air conditioning units on the site plan. We did that. They're located right here at the side right next to the new addition. The second was to extend the depth of the eaves and the rake boards, so I showed those on the elevations. We'll have a 12 inch overhang on the eaves and a 6 inch extension on the rake boards. The eaves here and the rake boards will be extended. Fourth comment was to add flower boxes at the three new windows at the front here, so we showed that. The fourth was to show lighting on the exterior, which was one light here at the front door and two lights on either side of the overhead door.

That's it. Thank you for your time. Happy to answer any questions.

MR. NEMECEK: Let's see if there are any members of the public hearing first.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to make a comment about the flower boxes. That's unusual.

MR. NEMECEK: I like that.

MR. IANNACITO: The existing house has flower boxes. I can't guarantee they'll be there forever. They'll be there the day the construction is done.

MR. NEMECEK: I could see where the ARB was somewhat -- I watched some of that ARB meeting, and I remember seeing this application. It is sort of a big sort of a plain wall where the addition is, so anything you could do to spruce that up, give it a little more depth, give it a little more action.

MR. IANNACITO: The black shutters and some of the flowers in the flower boxes will break it up a little bit.

THE CHAIRMAN: I barely could take care of the flowers in my yard, I have no idea how to take care of them when they're in the window.

So the public hearing. This is sort

of moot. So I make a motion to open the public hearing on this application, 19-18, 24 Shady Lane.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Close the public hearing on the same application, 24 Shady Lane.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Very nice job, as always.

MR. NEMECEK: It looks like it will be a nice addition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Best of luck to them. I make a motion to approve this application, 19-18, 24 Shady Lane.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now on to the last one, 118 Siwanoy Boulevard, Application 19-11.

MR. IANNACITO: Good evening, again.

This is a very similar application. My name is John Iannacito, I'm an architect, and I'm representing Mr. and Mrs. Yaghoubi, the owners of the subject property. So we're proposing an addition and alterations to the existing single family residence.

I'll come up to the drawings. The proposed scope of work will include removal of a one story garage, and then the addition of a two story addition at the side of the existing residence. The proposed addition required a side yard variance from the Zoning Board, and it was granted on May 14th. The proposed side yard is 4 feet and required is 8 feet, a deficiency of 4 feet or 50 percent.

Just go through the plans. Again, on the lowest floor, the addition will include an expansion of the garage. So it will be slightly smaller than an actual two car garage, almost like a one and a half. We were restricted by the side yard setback, so we really couldn't make it any bigger. At the rear of the addition, there will be a new laundry room and an exercise room. On the

second floor, the addition will consist of a new master suite, so a bedroom, two closets, and a master bathroom.

Here's the front elevation. Here's the addition on the side. Overhead door at the lower end, then a roof to match the right side, and then the upper portion will be set back a little bit further. Here is the side elevation showing the two story addition. At the rear, two story addition here and at the rear here.

Here is a rendering of the front facade. Again, all the materials here will also match existing. The wall surfaces will be a brick with a whitewash finish to match existing. The roof shingles will be asphalt in a charcoal finish. The shutters are composite to match existing in a hunter green finish. The overhead door will be fiberglass in a hunter green finish. The windows are vinyl clad in a dark bronze finish to match existing. The trim boards at the roof will be white in an AZEK finish.

This was also presented to the Architectural Review Board on June 6th, and

they had two comments. The first was to show the air conditioning units on the site plan. So those are shown here at the side. One is existing and one will be new. The second comment was to show lighting on the exterior facade. At the rear, they'll be two lights on either side of the sliding door from the exercise room. At the front, there will be two lights on either side of the garage door.

MR. WEST: The right side of that house, it just looks weird. It doesn't have the same balance as the rest of this side. The one story there, higher roof. I don't know.

MR. IANNACITO: This was added on a few years back.

MR. WEST: Aesthetically it looks a little out of place.

MR. IANNACITO: It's low and the roof pitch is different. If they would do another addition on top, it would be better. Maybe in a few years.

MR. WEST: Something. It just looks weird.

MR. NEMECEK: All of the work on the

front of the house is on the left side?

MR. IANNACITO: Yes.

MR. NEMECEK: Where the garage is right now; right?

MR. IANNACITO: Right. Here's the existing facade.

MR. NEMECEK: Is the setback of the existing garage going to be maintained with the addition?

MR. IANNACITO: Yes. The new addition will line up exactly with the existing one story. You could see it's dotted in on the survey here.

MR. NEMECEK: Is that setback the same as the setback on the right side that Mr. West is talking about?

MR. IANNACITO: No. The right side is closer to the front. It's a very small, only about 8 inch setback in the front.

MR. NEMECEK: Got it. In terms of the rear of the house -- I'm looking at the photographs, in particular the one that says, project site rear -- there does appear to be some form of a permanent deck back there?

MR. IANNACITO: Yes. It's a raised brick deck that runs along the entire rear of the property.

MR. NEMECEK: Is any portion of that deck going to be removed for the addition?

MR. IANNACITO: No. It shouldn't be the same because at some point it falls back behind -- there's a photo that shows it -- right behind that existing garage, and the grade drops off there. The new addition will end as an end point to the existing terrace, and you'll be able to walk right into the exercise room. The railing will die right into the side of the new addition here.

MR. NEMECEK: I see. Okay.

MR. IANNACITO: See how it drops off here right where the existing one story garage is now?

MR. TUDISCO: I've always been curious -- and I live around the corner from this house -- that's the oddest window next to the front door. Did there use to be a door there with steps coming down or something?

MR. IANNACITO: Really?

MR. TUDISCO: No, I'm asking you.
MR. IANNACITO: That's actually the staircase.
MR. TUDISCO: It's really bazaar looking.
MR. IANNACITO: It works from the inside.
THE CHAIRMAN: There's a stair.
MR. IANNACITO: As you go up the stair -- so you go up the stair here, you end up at this landing. The window is higher up because it starts at the landing height, and then it extends all the way up to the second floor. So when you're in the hallway upstairs, the window is at the height.
MR. TUDISCO: I guess it looks like it's the size of a door because the window is so long.
MR. IANNACITO: And it doesn't line up with anything. It's very close to the front entrance door. I think what they've done so far to the house with the darker windows and dark shutters, it looks nice. I mean, it's a nice looking house.

MR. NEMECEK: I have no issue with the extension. It looks like it has a very -- I mean, aesthetically you've done everything you can to match it up, and it also looks like it has a real utility in terms of what's going to be housed there.
THE CHAIRMAN: So let's just do this. I make a motion to open the public hearing on this application, 19-11, 118 Siwanoy.
MR. NEMECEK: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
(All aye.)
(No comments.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Close the public on 118 Siwanoy Boulevard.
MR. NEMECEK: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
(All aye.)
THE CHAIRMAN: That's it. Looks good, John. Thank you.
MR. IANNACITO: Great. Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: I make a motion to approve this application, 118 Siwanoy Boulevard.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
(All aye.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MR. IANNACITO: Thank you. Have a nice summer.
THE CHAIRMAN: Same to you. Before we close, can we approve any minutes?
MR. NEMECEK: I have not had the chance to look at last month's minutes.
MS. UHLE: You didn't do the April 25th minutes yet?
MR. NEMECEK: No, we just got those.
MS. UHLE: So we'll wait until next time.
MR. NEMECEK: It was 157 pages and I was just too busy.
THE CHAIRMAN: It's really 157 pages?
MR. NEMECEK: I started, but I just didn't get through. I did read the piece on the Main Street application. That was at the very end.
THE CHAIRMAN: Glad you read the piece.

MR. NEMECEK: Refresh myself to be ready.
THE CHAIRMAN: So then I make a motion to close the Town of Eastchester Planning Board meeting of June 27, 2019.
MR. NEMECEK: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
(All aye.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Have a nice summer all.
MS. UHLE: Thank you, everyone. Have a great summer.

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/27/19

CERTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 2nd day of August, 2019.

Dina M. Morgan

DINA M. MORGAN
Court Reporter

EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 6/27/19

CORRECTION SHEET

PAGE	CORRECTION