

September 20, 2011

**TUCKAHOE PLANNING BOARD
TUCKAHOE VILLAGE HALL – 7:30pm**

Present:

Chairperson	Ann Marie Ciaramella
Commissioner	Raymond Nerenberg
Commissioner	Eric Fang
Commissioner	Melba Caliano
Commissioner	Antonio Leo
Commissioner	Tim Miller
Commissioner	Clare Gorman

Also in Attendance:

Commissioner	Sandy Reyes-Guerra (ad hoc)
John Cavallaro	Village Attorney
Bill Williams	Building Inspector
Jim Pinto	Village Consultant

Chairwoman Ciaramella announced the evening's agenda as follows:

Item #1	145 – 147 Main Street	Return
Item #2	16 Chestnut	Site Plan
Item #3	150, 160, 233 Main Street	Return
Item #4	1 Midland Place	Return
Item #5	Crestwood Station Plaza LLC	
	300 Columbus Avenue	Site Plan

Item #1 145 – 147 Main Street Return
Applicant was not present.

Item #2 16 Chestnut Site Plan

Robert and Katie Venice, builders of 16 Chestnut, stated that their architect could not make this meeting. Mr. Venice requested that the change to the plans be permitted for the use of brick on the steps in place of the originally planned stone steps. The supplier is finding it difficult to obtain the stone and the cost has doubled since the plans were approved. Mr. Venice submitted samples of the brick to be used.

Chairwoman Ciaramella indicated that if the Board approves this, it would just be for the brick to be used in lieu of the stone.

Commissioner Gorman motioned to accept the change from stone to brick, was seconded by Commissioner Nerenberg and carried unanimously by the Board.

Item #3 150, 160, 233 Main Street Return

Mr. Null, attorney representing the applicant, noted that the applicant has submitted the site plan drawings and received comments from the consultants. The only change was the relocation of the building on Midland Place, 2ft. back from originally planned.

Mr. Phil Raffiani indicated that the crosswalk from the site to the park across the street must be handled by the Police Dept. and DPW. He is willing to finance the signage and crosswalk, but the location and striping of the crosswalk would need to be taken care of by the various departments. The lobby of building #2 is now pulled back, which will now allow for 30in. of green planting where there was originally 18in. The sidewalk, which gets very few pedestrians, will be increased from 5 ft. to 9ft. in width. One major issue, which still needs to be discussed further, is whether to line the trees on Winterhill Rd. along the street or beside the building. The sidewalk will be 5ft. in width.

Commissioner Caliano voiced her opinion that the trees should be beside the building to prevent damage to the trees due to snow removal and salt during the winter months.

Commissioner Gorman agreed with Commissioner Caliano.

Commissioner Fang stated that it was the safety of the pedestrians and not the safety of the trees that is important. The trees, therefore, should line the street to buffer the traffic as well as offer shade and security to the pedestrians. Winterhill Rd. could be quite exposed and uncomfortable for the pedestrians if there is no buffer between them and the busy traffic. Tree-lined streets are the tradition in towns and villages and offer a safe feeling for pedestrians.

Mr. Raffiani noted that the sidewalk will have a redbrick border similar to the Main St. area.

Commissioner Caliano offered the idea of a split sidewalk with steps.

Mr. Null stated that there would be a liability issue with steps and it would not be ADA compliant.

Mr. Raffiani added that there is ample time for discussion regarding the placement of the trees. Midland Pl. will have trees located in standard curb boxes along the street.

Mr. Glen Vetromile, Glenmark Properties, submitted a memo stating that the project will possess the attributes necessary to qualify for LEED Certified status. The applicant does not plan to apply for LEED Certified status, but it does indeed qualify.

Commissioner Fang questioned the width of the sidewalk in front of Building #2.

Mr. Raffiani noted that once the building is pulled back 2ft., the sidewalk will measure 9ft. wide. This will reduce the internal space by reducing the depth of the rooms. The 9ft. sidewalk is not necessary, as the 5ft. sidewalk is ample for the foot traffic on that road.

Commissioner Fang noted that it was not the Board's intent for the applicant to lose square footage, it was more about the setback between the building and the sidewalk.

Commissioner Leo added that there needs to be more discussion regarding the plans for the park across Main St.

Mr. Raffiani agreed, but although he plans to finance the upgrade to the park, he would like the DPW to spearhead the plans and collect input from the residents.

Mr. Jim Pinto, Village Consultant, stated that the applicant has already addressed the concerns stated in his Sept. 18, 2011 memo regarding the proposed plans. He added that since the applicant will submit environmental samples on the project, he advised the Board to hire an Environmental Engineer, on retainer, to review those plans.

Chairwoman Ciaramella read a memo from BFJ Planning regarding the parking layout. (See attached pg.6).

Bill Williams, Building Inspector indicated that he sent the plans to the Fire Dept. for review. The Chief noted that the two driveways do not meet the code, as they must be 26 ft. wide.

Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that the Board will discuss the placement of the trees and the applicant must give attention to the Fire Dept.'s comments.

Item #4 1 Midland Place Return

Mr. Martin Hero, representing the applicant Mr. McGrath, indicated that the landscape plans for the single-family house was as follows: annual flowers will border the porch, arbor vitae and rhododendron in front and a pink dogwood tree. The air conditioner will be placed in the rear of the house. The white picket fence will stay. The requested repositioning of three front windows will line up, but as for the rear of the house, the windows cannot line up, as there is a tub in the bathroom where the window would have to be. The extended canopy will wrap around the sides of the porch. The siding of the house will be Sage Mountain Green; roof- medium bronze color; front porch- composite trek materials; deck- teak wood; Trim- asteck, a solid plastic, which is requires low maintenance; railings and trim - all white.

Commissioner Gorman asked if the arbor vitae will be kept at a certain height.

Mr. Hero noted that they will measure 4 – 5 ft. in height, as there is a 3ft. drop right at the property line.

Commissioner Fang asked if the applicant had drawings, which showed the house compared to the neighbors.

Mr. Hero answered he did not.

Commissioner Caliano motioned to accept the plans as presented tonight, seconded by Commissioner Leo and unanimously carried by the Board.

**Item #5 Crestwood Station Plaza LLC
300 Columbus Avenue Site Plan**

Mr. Robert Davis, attorney for the applicant, indicated that he was part of the re-zoning of this area back in 2010. The applicant has recently purchased the property from the previous owners and would like to go forward with the plans to build. The plans are slightly modified since the previous presentation.

Chairwoman Ciaramella stated that the process requires that the applicant submit the plans in ample time for the Board members to review. In addition, the applicant needs to appear before the Board during an informal workshop to discuss the plans. All this is done prior to the public meeting so the Board members can make a more enlightened decision. In this case, this was not done, so tonight will just be a presentation for the Board members to get acquainted with this application.

Mr. Richard Heapes, cofounder and partner of Streetworks, a company known for restoring Main Streets across the country. The applicants are the designers, developers and owners of the project. He submitted photos of past projects in Bethesda, MD., West Hartford, CT and others. The plans for the Crestwood Station Plaza is for the building to be all lofts, 15ft. wide x 42 ft. long. each with a full bath, W/D, sleeping alcove, kitchen, and living room. All will have very large glass windows. The plan is to have essentially one-person units, maybe a few couples. This building will not be for families. The units will be small and efficient with very tall ceilings. The target group is for transitional occupancy, high income, attractive to the area, which offers, train station, dry cleaners, restaurants etc. There will be no children and these owners tend to have fewer vehicles as they rely heavily on the trains. The expected car owners per unit is .75 cars per unit.

The plans are to keep retail on the street level with two floors of lofts above. A total of 38968 Floor Area, 3600 retail space, 49 dwelling units, 69 parking spaces and a building height of 38 ft. The parking plans were changed slightly and made more efficient than the original plans. There will not be as many tandem parking spaces, and there will be parking under the building as well.

Mr. Heapes presented photos of buildings found in the Crestwood and Tuckahoe areas and noted that the plans for this building will be similar. The lower level will have retail and the upper levels will be residential. A two-story façade will face Columbus, retail on the base, large windows, three-stories total, with two levels of residential lofts. Brick façade with pre-cast large windows.

John Richman indicated that the location is close to the train with walking distance to restaurants and such, was vital. The units will have wood floors, 9.5ft ceilings, track lighting and a large bathroom. They will have a very sophisticated architectural design. The character of each unit is very important. The original proposed plans compared to the revised plans are as follows- 26 units, which consisted of 21 two-bedroom units, and 5 one-bedroom units for a total of 47 bedrooms to the new plans, which will have 49 units for a total of 49 bedrooms. 90% will be single occupancy, based on experience, same FAR and same building configuration. The height of the building varies from different locations on the site from 36ft., 32ft and 38ft.

Robert Davis discussed three topics, impacts on schools, taxes and traffic/parking.

The units will measure 456 sq. ft. to 620 sq. ft. The original plans for this application was for 750 sq. ft. to 900 sq. ft. per unit. These units are for single occupancy. The prior plan calculated that there would be 3 school-aged children. This plan will generate 0 children for the schools.

Traffic – there are 70-90 cars parked on the site at the present time. Using the most conservative numbers, there are 39 trips in the am and 22 trips in the pm. This will be reduced to 33 trips, which is a 40% reduction due to the proximity to the trains. One and two-bedroom units require more parking.

The parking ordinance requires 98 spaces, which is 2 per unit. These units, which are small studios, will require fewer spaces. The proposed plans are 51 spaces, 11 commercial and 8 metered. The 11 spaces for the commercial should be enough with the metered spots and municipal parking lot nearby. The reduction will be from 73 spaces to 69 spaces. The tandem spaces will be reduced from 46 to 12 tandem spaces. The applicant will need to seek a variance from the Zoning Board for the parking variance and for a Special Use permit for residential above commercial.

This project produces \$80,000 in taxes as is. The increase will be to \$245,000 taxes for this project, with the Village receiving an increase of \$57,600 per year.

Commissioner Gorman noted that was a member of the Village Board of Trustees when this area was re-zoned and she was quite surprised that the applicant was asking for a variance for the parking requirement. The Board was very clear that two parking spaces per unit would be required, but the Board did not want to change the ordinance.

Mr. Davis noted that the Village Board is a legislative body and could have proposed text changes to the zoning ordinance but chose not to. The Village Board has no authority with site plan and cannot get involved with site plan.

John Cavallaro, Village Attorney, stated that textual change to the parking requirements from 2 spaces to 1.5 spaces were not enacted by the Village Board. The Village Board decided to stay with the required two parking spaces per dwelling unit.

Bill Williams, Building Inspector noted that the applicant cannot present their application to the Zoning Board without the Planning Board's recommendation.

John Cavallaro, Village Attorney, noted that in Section 6-2.4 for Special Use Permits, the applicant can go to the Planning Board first for review and then proceed to the Zoning Board. As per the parking variance, the applicant can go to the Zoning Board to request a parking variance without the Planning Board's recommendation.

Bill Williams, Building Inspector noted that the parking variance may not be the only variance needed by this applicant.

There being no further comments from the public or business before the Board, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Date: September 19, 2011

To: Village of Tuckahoe Planning Board

From: Georges Jacquemart
Contact Information: T. 212.353.7477 F. 212.353.7494 E. G.Jacquemart@bfjplanning.com

Project Name: The Glenmark
Project Number:
Subject: Review of Parking Layout

Filename: Parking Review memo 110919

Discussion: We have reviewed the latest site plan dated 2011-05-09, in particular plan SP-103 showing the diagrammatic garage floor plans. The following are our comments:

Some of the parking spaces at the end of the aisles do not allow easy maneuvering for standard size vehicles. They should be signed and reserved for compact cars. The attached sketches show these spaces.

For the two upper levels that are 10'8" above the levels below the average slope for the ramp is 10.6% (assuming that the square corner section of the ramp is also sloped). If we incorporate two 12-foot long transition sections at half the ramp slope we will have a 12% slope for the ramp including the sharp turn. We recommend that these slopes be reduced slightly by extending the ramps at the top and at the bottom as shown on the attached drawing.

It is also important that the sight distances and visibility be maximized for the vehicles driving up or down the ramp. Any structures separating the ramp from adjacent parked vehicles should be open or low walls. The southerly corners of the shaft that separates the ramp from adjacent parking should be rounded so that drivers can see "around the corner" and have a more fluid movement. See the attached sketch.