

October 18, 2011

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

**Present:** Chairperson Ann Marie Ciaramella  
Commissioner Raymond Nerenberg  
Commissioner Eric Fang  
Commissioner Tim Miller  
Commissioner Clare Gorman

**Absent:** Commissioner Melba Caliano  
Commissioner Antonio Leo  
Commissioner Sandy Reyes-Guerra (ad hoc)

**Also in Attendance:**  
John Cavallaro Village Attorney  
Bill Williams Building Inspector

**Chairwoman Ciaramella announced the evening's agenda as follows:**

- Item #1** Approval of Minutes Meeting held on September 20, 2011
- Item #2** Approval of Minutes Meeting held on August 31, 2011
- Item #3** Approval of Minutes Meeting held on August 2, 2011
- Item #4** Approval of Minutes Meeting held on July 19, 2011
- Item #5** 109 Lake Avenue Site Plan
- Item #6** 72 Main Street Site Plan
- Item #7** 150, 160, 233 Main Street Extended Site Plan
- Item #8** 150, 160, 233 Main Street Return
- Item #9** 181 Marbledale Road Site Plan
- Item #10** Crestwood Station Plaza LLC  
300 Columbus Avenue Site Plan
- Item #11** 16 Chestnut Adjourned

**Item #1 Approval of Minutes Meeting held on September 20, 2011**

Motion by Commissioner Nerenberg to approve the minutes from the Regular Meeting – September 20, 2011 was seconded by Commissioner Gorman and was carried by the Board with a vote of 5-0.

**Item #2 Approval of Minutes Meeting held on August 31, 2011**

Motion by Commissioner Nerenberg to approve the minutes from the Special Meeting – August 31, 2011 was seconded by Commissioner Gorman.

Discussion: Commissioner Fang commended the Chairperson regarding the Glenmark Property’s application. She navigated both the Board members and the public professionally with the many complex issues of this project. He also complimented his colleagues on the Board for their appreciation regarding their discussions during the review process and without judgment. Motion was carried by the Board with a vote of 5-0.

**Item #3 Approval of Minutes Meeting held on August 2, 2011**

Motion by Commissioner Miller to approve the minutes from the Special Meeting – August 2, 2011 was seconded by Commissioner Fang and was carried by the Board with a vote of 5-0.

**Item #4 Approval of Minutes Meeting held on July 19, 2011**

Motion by Commissioner Nerenberg to approve the minutes from the Regular Meeting – July 19, 2011 was seconded by Commissioner Fang and was carried by the Board with a vote of 5-0.

**Item #5 109 Lake Avenue                      Site Plan**

Sheila Bezada and Carlos Donan, applicants proposing a small dance studio in the back of 109 Lake Ave. Next door is a dentist office and an insurance company. The classes will be held from 7:00am – 9:00am before the offices next door open for business. The evening classes will be held from 6:00pm – 10:00pm, after their businesses close for the day. The studio is not near any residential area. The music will be played softly, so the students can hear the instructor. As for parking, there are 3 parking spaces assigned to the dance studio and 23 open spaces for use during those hours.

**No Public Comments**

**Motion by Commissioner Fang to accept the proposal as presented tonight, was seconded by Commissioner Gorman and carried unanimously with a vote of 5 – 0.**

**Item #6 72 Main Street                      Site Plan**

James Margeotes, applicant proposing a self-serve café in the vacant storefront next to Bubblemania Laundromat. There will be six tables by the front of the store for patrons whom wish to sit and eat. A cashier station, self-serve coffee station, sink, refrigerator, frozen yogurt machine, and pre-packaged food. There will be no preparation or cooking of food on the premises. All the food is pre-packaged and delivered. There will be a handicap area, bathroom for employees and patrons, small closet, washing room, and storage area. The hard wood floors and hung ceilings will remain.

Chairwoman Ciaramella asked about the trash pickup.

Mr. Margeotes noted that there is a private driveway in the back. The trash will be picked up using the driveway and the deliveries will use the driveway as well.

**No Public Comments**

**Motion by Commissioner Fang to accept the proposal as submitted tonight, seconded by Commissioner Gorman and carried unanimously with a vote of 5 – 0.**

**Item #7 146, 150, 160, 233 Main Street Extended Site Plan**

Mr. Null, attorney representing the applicant, requested a one-year extension for the site plan. All the conditions were met except for the fence. The property has a safe and appropriate fence and to be required to install a new temporary fence with vinyl slats would be costly. The conditions to demolish the Jiffy Lube building and remove the jersey barriers were all met.

John Cavallaro, Village Attorney, read from the minutes dated Oct. 20, 2009

Chairwoman Ciaramella motioned to approve the extension application for one year with the following conditions: Jiffy Lube building be leveled within two months, cleanup the property on both sides of Midland Ave., no heavy equipment may be stored on the site without site plan approval, a chain link fence with slats must be erected within two months to screen the site, remove the current barriers and replace with suitable barriers and that the building which will remain on the site is subject to the existing zoning code requirements. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Nerenberg.

Discussion: Mr. Null asked the Board to consider a two-year extension as investors may not be as agreeable if the approval is close to its expiration date.

The Board voiced their concerns approving a two-year extension, as the applicant would not have to appear before the Board to answer concerns regarding the maintenance of the property.

Bill Williams, Building Inspector, noted that the property could be monitored through the building management.

Commissioner Nerenberg motioned to amend the approval to include a two-year extension with the building department supervising the condition of the site.

This amendment to the motion was seconded by Commissioner Leo and the resolution was carried by the Board with a vote of 5 – 0.

Mr. Raffiani stated that there have been no issues, no trespassing, no vandalism and no complaints. It is just two vacant lots.

**7:58pm Chairwoman Ciaramella called for a brief recess.**

**8:02pm The public hearing reconvened.**

**No Public Comments**

**Commissioner Miller read the following resolution:**

VILLAGE OF TUCKAHOE PLANNING BOARD  
VILLAGE OF TUCKAHOE, NEW YORK

In the Matter of the Application of  
MIDORA CORP./GLENMARK PARTNERS, LLC,  
Premises: 146, 150, 160 Main Street,  
233 Midland Avenue,  
Tuckahoe, New York,  
Applicant.

**FINDINGS OF FACT,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW  
AND DECISION**

**Background and Findings of Fact:**

The Applicant is the record owner of the Premises commonly known as 146, 150 and 160 Main Street and 233 Midland Avenue, Tuckahoe, New York and identified on the tax map of the Village of Tuckahoe (the "Village") as Section 29, Block 4 and Lots 1, 3-8, 13, 17, 33, 36, 39 and 40 and Section 29, Block 9 and Lots 1 and 25 (the "Premises"). The Premises is located in a Business/Residential Zoning District and consist of approximately 2.4 acres of land.

**A. The Current Nature of the Application:**

The Premises consists of several tax lots on which buildings and/or parking facilities are proposed to be constructed and utilized for a mixed commercial and residential use. On 233 Midland Avenue, the building designated as Building 1 as set forth in the Applicant's Environmental Assessment Form dated June 2011, would be a three-story building containing approximately 24 dwelling units, having an address of 233 Midland Avenue. Pedestrian access would be from Midland Avenue with vehicular

access from Midland Place. Further, residents parking their cars in the parking structure would have direct access from the parking structure into 233 Midland Avenue. On 160 Main Street, the building designated as Building 2 in the Applicant's Environmental Assessment Form dated June 2011, would be a four-story building containing approximately 63 dwelling units, having an address of 160 Main Street. Pedestrian and vehicular access would be from Midland Place, with parking provided in a 204-space parking structure integrated into the rear of Building 2 and the base of Building 1. The parking structure would include three levels of above-ground parking and one level of below-ground parking. This parking would be shared by residents of 233 Midland Avenue ("Building 1"). On 150 Main Street, the building designated as Building 3 in the Applicant's Environmental Assessment Form dated June 2011, would be a three-story building containing approximately 34 dwelling units and approximately 3,500 square feet of commercial use in the ground floor fronting on Main Street. Off-street parking would be provided in an at-grade parking area (approximately 18 spaces) and below the building (approximately 38 spaces) and would be accessed off Midland Place.

**B. Relief From the Zoning Ordinance:**

To achieve their development goals for the Premises, the Applicant sought a Special Use Permit from the Village of Tuckahoe Zoning Board of Appeals (the "Zoning Board") allowing them to utilize the Premises for residential and commercial uses. In addition, the Applicant sought relief from the Village Zoning Ordinance with respect to the following issues: (i) number of stories; (ii) floor area ratio ("FAR"); and (iii) building height. The scope of the relief requested through the area variances was as follows:

	<u>Required</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
<b>Floor Area Ratio:</b>		
160/233 Midland Avenue	1.2	1.48
<b>Height (in feet):</b>		
160 Main Street	42'	43'9"
<b>Number of Stories:</b>		
160 Main Street	3	4
<b>Parking</b> (total residential and commercial)		
150 Main Street	129	53
160 Main Street	140	216

After conducting public hearings and extensively weighing the proposed benefits against the burdens of granting the above relief, the Zoning Board arrived at the well-reasoned determination that the relief requested by the Applicant would have no detrimental effects on the surrounding community. Additionally, the relief requested was found to be consistent with the pattern of uses and development in this area. Thus, by a March 12, 2008 resolution, the Zoning Board granted the relief requested by the Applicant with respect to the Special Use Permit sought as well as the area variances.

### **C. Planning Board Review:**

An amended application was filed with the Planning Board by the Applicant's representatives, William S. Null, Esq. of Cuddy and Feder, LLP and by AKRF Environmental and Planning Consultants ("AKRF"), for approval of an amended site plan for the Premises. The Applicant's architect, Norman Cox, also appeared at Planning Board meetings to discuss the nature and scope of the project. The Planning Board met on several dates and convened at several public meetings as reflected in the minutes to consider and hear an application for an amended site plan review.

William S. Null, Esq. and AKRF, among other parties, represented and spoke on behalf of the Applicant at the meetings and public hearings. The project's environmental effects, benefits to the Applicant, potential burdens on the community and nature and scope of the project, among other issues, were extensively discussed and deliberated before the Planning Board and the interested public. At a regular meeting of the Planning Board, the Planning Board declared itself the lead agency under the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") for the review of the project as it concerns the amended site plan review.

In connection with its application for an amended site plan review, the Applicant offered supporting documentation to the Planning Board, including but not limited to the project's amended site plan, surveys, drawings, materials, renderings, elevations, sketches, studies and environmental assessment forms with supplements as required by the Planning Board and its

planning consultant, BFJ Planning. The project's design, physical dimensions, layout and uses were extensively discussed before the Planning Board and through written submissions submitted to the Planning Board.

The following issues were identified or extensively deliberated before the Planning Board: (i) impacts on schools and the generation of school-aged children from the project; (ii) existing conditions affecting the project such as land use, neighborhood and community character, public policy, community facilities and emergency services; (iii) traffic conditions; (iv) parking accommodations and considerations; (v) pedestrian conditions; (vi) environmental site assessments, including analysis of hazardous materials, flooding, storm water mitigation, underground storage tanks and existing and proposed topography and sewerage; (vii) building height, scale and aesthetic impact; (viii) ingress and egress to the Premises; (ix) potential nuisances; (x) the project's compatibility with the Village's Comprehensive Plan; (xi) solid waste generated, if any, and other issues relevant to the planning process.

**D. Extension of the Previous Site Plan Approval:**

On November 10, 2008, this Planning Board granted conditional site plan approval so the Premises may be developed with a project that then consisted of four buildings that would improve the Premises with two live/work loft units at 146 Main Street; commercial space and 18 residential units at 150 Main Street; and 70 residential units at 160 Main Street and 233 Midland Avenue. By resolution dated October 20, 2009, the aforesaid conditional site plan approval was extended for a two-year period from October 20, 2009 to October 19, 2011. The Applicant now requests that an additional one-year extension be granted to the conditional site plan resolution dated November 10, 2008, that originally granted conditional site plan approval to the Applicant. The Applicant has requested an extension of the conditional site plan approval granted by this Board on November 10, 2008 to construct, use and maintain a mixed-use building at the Premises. The Applicant seeks a one-year extension of the prior approval. The Applicant asserts there have been no materially changed circumstances since the prior approval was granted.

Based on the foregoing, it is resolved that the site plan approval referenced herein that was previously granted is hereby ratified and reaffirmed as granted to the Applicant, so that there has been no lapse in the continuity thereof.

The Zoning Ordinance sets forth periods for the commencement of construction and timing for the lapsing of site plan approval at Article 7, Section 7-1.6 of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Expiration. Unless other provisions are specifically set forth by the Planning Board in connection with its approval of a site plan, such approval shall expire if substantial construction is not completed within one year of approval or if all required improvements are not completed within two years of approval or if the construction or use shall cease for more than six months in any twelve-month period.

In recognizing that the Planning Board had previously granted a two-year extension to its conditional site plan approval for this development due to the current financial challenges facing the commencement of construction and the absence of any materially changed circumstances that would warrant any different decision than that granted by the prior approval, this Board notes that demolition of a portion of the buildings on the Premises has been completed.

Based on the foregoing, this Planning Board has determined to extend the conditional site plan approval dated November 10, 2008, as extended, for an additional period of one year, to expire on October 17, 2012. The Applicant and/or interested third parties are notified of their respective rights to appeal this decision or any part thereof in accordance with the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules.

**E. Conditions of the Previous Site Plan Approval:**

The Planning Board's extension herein of the prior site plan approval for the project is subject to the conditions set forth in the resolution of the Planning Board granting site plan approval dated November 10, 2008 and, further, those conditions set forth in the resolution of the Planning Board extending the site plan approval for a two-year period, dated October 20, 2009.

The conditions set forth in the prior grant of site plan approval, dated November 10, 2008, are incorporated by reference herein as if fully stated and repeated herein. The conditions set forth in the October 20, 2009 resolution of the Planning Board extending the site plan approval for a two-year period are incorporated by reference herein as if fully stated and repeated herein.

**F. SEQRA:**

Based on the foregoing, the Planning Board of the Village of Tuckahoe finds and determines that:

1. The action taken herein is an Unlisted Action subject to the requirements of SEQRA.
2. This Planning Board is in possession of all information reasonably necessary to make the determination as to environmental significance of the application for extension of the site plan approval.
3. The action taken herein shall not have any significant impacts upon the environment and declare that a Negative Declaration be adopted with respect to this action.

Dated: Tuckahoe, New York  
October 18, 2011

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ann Marie Ciaramella,  
Planning Board Chairperson  
Village of Tuckahoe Planning Board

**Motion was seconded by Commissioner Gorman.**

**Discussion: Mr. Null requested that the application name be referred to as Dormani of NY Inc. as the owner of 146 Main St.**

**Commissioner Nerenberg motioned to accept the amendment to the resolution.**

**Commissioner Gorman seconded the motion to amend the resolution and was carried with a vote of 5 – 0.**

**Chairwoman Ciaramella motioned to approve the resolution read by Commissioner Miller with the amendment of the installation of the fence, seconded by Commissioner Nerenberg and carried by the Board with a vote of 5 – 0.**

**Item #8 150, 160, 233 Main Street Return**

Mr. Glen Vetromile, submitted a memo to the Board dated Oct. 18, 2011 stating that he was prepared to contribute \$125,000 to facilitate the improvement of the perimeter of the Main Street park adjacent to the Glenmark development. The area proposed for improvement is depicted on Landscape Plan LA-101 dated 2/23/11, and will include approximately 180 lineal feet on Main Street and approximately 300 lineal feet on Marbledale Road, of 5- 6 ft. tall industrial grade aluminum fence, posts and footings and 1- 6 ft. of fieldstone wall. The park will be included in the architectural review portion of this project and the applicants welcome the residents' input.

Commissioner Miller asked if the construction of the development will coincide with the construction of the park.

Mr. Vetromile answered yes.

Commissioner Gorman requested that the DPW give input regarding the trees and shrubs to be consistent with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Fang asked if there has been conversations with the Mayor regarding the plans for the park.

Mr. Raffiani indicated that Mayor Ecklund was interested in getting the park updated. Mr. Raffiani asked that the Village take the lead role in getting the plans completed and resident's input.

Commissioner Fang noted that the residents of the new Glenmark project will likely use the park and therefore, the applicant's goal should not be just the fence and signage.

Mr. Null agreed that the park will benefit the residents of the Glenmark Property, but stated that the Village must take the lead role so they are satisfied with the results within the limits of the proposal.

Bill Williams, Building Inspector added that it was his understanding that the Fire Dept. had no issues and no problem with the access to the Glenmark Project. He did not receive a written response.

Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that the Board would continue to discuss where the trees should be located on Midland Ave., along the street or along the building.

A resolution will be prepared for next month.

**Item #9 181 Marbledale Road Site Plan**

Jack Hughes, attorney for the applicant, Mr. Cacciola, indicated that the applicant has operated a service center on Marbledale Rd. for many years. He amended the original site plan and eliminated the plans for an office space. He proposes a service and repair service along with a car wash. There will be a green roof, with solar panels, which are self-sustaining, and energy wise, and the water used for washing the cars will be recycled on the premises. This water will only be used for washing the cars, not for drinking. The applicant will store the water, filter and re-use the water.

Mr. Abillama, architect for the applicant, stated that the plans submitted are for a car wash, repair shop and there will not be an office. There is 4500 sq. ft., the plans are to remove the front of the building and canopy and build an extension in the back of the building. The applicant will level the property and construct a parking lot below the proposed extension of the building. There is 30,000 sq. ft. of open land behind the building. The curb cuts for the repair shop already exist.

The plans for trash removal and oil storage will be at the next presentation.

Commissioner Gorman asked about any items located on the roof of the repair shop.

Mr. Abillama noted that a fan and condenser would be located on the roof.

Commissioner Fang asked the Building Dept. to review the plans for the underground parking lot for run off.

Mr. Abillama stated that he does not anticipate any blasting of the land.

Mr. Cacciola indicated that borings were done and there is only dirt on the property. He noted that all the noise would be contained in the repair shop. He has been doing this for 20 years. A machine called the Dyno machine is very loud, which he used during the 20 years with no complaints of noise. That machine is no longer in existence. The repair shop will open for business from 7:00am – 7:00pm.

Commissioner Fang requested 3D visuals for the next public hearing and a view from the street as well as from up the side of the rear hill. He also requested a larger area map that zoomed out to illustrate the context better and an aerial view to scale.

Bill Williams, Building Inspector noted that the property directly behind the site is 50,000sq. ft. of vacant land that cannot be built on.

**Chairwoman Ciaramella motioned to open the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Nerenberg and unanimously carried by the Board.**

**No Public Comments**

**Chairwoman Ciaramella motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Nerenberg and unanimously carried by the Board**

The applicant will return next month.

**Item #10 Crestwood Station Plaza LLC**  
**300 Columbus Avenue      Site Plan**

John Richman, summarized the proposed plans and compared them to the development he built in Hartford, Ct., Blue Back Square. He noted that according to the Reis data survey, in comparing all class A apartments in the area, the Blue Back Square lofts were demanding the highest monthly rent. The units are very popular and currently have an 18-month waiting list. In this case, location is not everything. The architectural design and layout are both very important. With regards to Crestwood, the location, which is close to the train station and amenities, is very important.

Chairwoman Ciaramella asked why the interest in railroad apartments.

Mr. Richman noted that in Blue Back Square, 34 of the 48 units are railroad apartments. The 44 ft. long and 15 ft. wide size are considered a luxury apartments.

Commissioner Fang asked Mr. Richman to name 5 of the most critical elements for a high rental apartment.

Mr. Richman identified the high ceilings with track lighting, large windows, huge bathroom, wood floors, washer and dryer and a decent size bedroom, big enough for a king size bed.

Commissioner Nerenberg voiced his concern regarding the project. He noted that this is a residential area, this rental community will draw people that will not be part of the community. This will become a 'bedroom community'. This project is not desirable in this 100-year-old community.

Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that the narrow loft seems depressing to live in. The buildings look prison-like. She noted that this is an established community that is home to many families. This project will draw a transient group. The residents will need a car, as there is no supermarket nearby. She stated that Tuckahoe is the downtown area, not Crestwood. This project does not blend in with the community.

Mr. Richman noted that it was his experience that the tenants of these lofts tend to be from the neighborhood and decide it was time to downsize. Some tenants may move to Tuckahoe to rent for a short time while they look for a home. This area will be a rental property. This project will bring in well-healed tenants. He stated that the Tuckahoe Comprehensive Plan 2008 noted that Columbus Ave. was a major thoroughfare, Crestwood was high density, 53% of Tuckahoe were renters and that Crestwood was a major neighborhood, a shopping and professional service district. He added that he was proposing a very similar building that was before the Board prior to this applicant. The previous building had 47 bedrooms, this has 49 bedrooms.

Commissioner Nerenberg stated that the Crestwood Station is the only station that does not have access to any parkway. Lincoln Ave. is closed to commercial traffic as it is a residential area. This project will completely change the area.

Commissioner Gorman complimented the applicant on his beautiful work, but this project does not fit or match the surrounding areas.

Mr. Richman noted that this project has the same massing as the proposed project presented before the Village Board in October 2009.

Bill Williams, Building Inspector noted that the proposed building was never approved.

Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that the original project looked like homes, this project looks box-like. It does not fit into the area.

Commissioner Fang noted that although the two projects may have the same massing, the difference within the massing envelope are quite different. A pitched roof has slightly less massing and is softer to the eye.

Mr. Richman pointed out the difference in heights of the buildings of the two projects.

The original building facing Lincoln Ave. and moving toward Columbus Ave. measures from 33.6ft to 30ft. to 33.6ft. when measured from grade to mid-roof.

This project measures 38ft. to 32.7ft. to 36ft. which is an increase of 2.5ft. The increase in height is due to the proposed 9.5 ft. high ceilings in the apartments.

Mr. Richman noted that the building across the street from the proposed project measures 38ft. to the top of the crest. This project is 32ft. to 36ft on Columbus Ave.

He noted that if the project were two separate buildings, both would be compliant and would not require a variance. There would also be an entrance and driveway on Lincoln Ave., which is not desirable.

Mr. Richman noted that there is a clear sight triangle with the intersection on Lincoln and Columbus. The location of the building does not have an impact on the safety of the intersection.

Mr. Richman added that if the building on Lincoln Ave. were pulled back 6 ft. from the property line, the parking lot would lose 3 spaces. Therefore, the project will either require a setback variance or a parking variance. The project will gain a set back or lose some parking spaces. There could be landscaping surrounding the residential entry, but the applicant would rather not put landscaping around the retail area as that would be detrimental to their businesses.

Commissioner Gorman noted that she was not in favor of granting a parking variance for the required two parking spaces. In the past, Frank Fish, the Village Consultant offered the idea of 1.5 parking spaces and the Village Board stayed firm with the two parking spaces per unit requirement.

Commissioner Fang asked if the applicant would consider decreasing the scale and volume of the building while keeping the desirable high ceilings and large windows. Tuckahoe has a wide variety of buildings with large windows and loft-like commercial feeling, but Crestwood does not have that, it is family oriented and residential.

Mr. Richman noted that it was Board's interest to attract the high-income tenants. This community currently has 53% of its residents whom rent. This project will most likely be a rental property. The people attracted to these loft-like apartments are not serial renters, they will most likely be potential homeowners.

If the proposed project changes its loft-like apartments to include one and two-bedroom units, the issue of school-aged children come into play.

Commissioner Miller noted that the previous applicant spent quite a significant amount of time designing the Lincoln Ave. side due to the sensitive transition to single-family homes.

John Richman requested a recommendation from this Board to present to the Zoning Board for a Special Use Permit.

John Cavallaro, Village Attorney, noted that the Board should take some time to review the data presented tonight. He also added that 3 Board members were absent tonight.

Mr. Robert Davis, attorney for the applicant, asked if the Board would refer the matter to the Zoning Board while they formulate their comments. He noted that this was a preliminary review of the application.

John Cavallaro, Village Attorney, noted that the Board will discuss the matter during their workshop and a resolution will be prepared for the next meeting.

**Chairwoman Ciaramella motioned to open the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Miller and carried unanimously by the Board.**

### **Public Comments**

Tracey Shivone 27 Fisher Ave. noted that the residents in her area were not able to make it to tonight's meeting to voice their opposition. There are many elderly and young families with young children. She stated that the applicant did not purchase the property. She asked that the Board require the applicant to put together a proposal that complies with the Zoning Laws for this village. She stated that the applicant suggested that the persons whom will be potential tenants will like a king size bed. A king size bed is usually for two people, therefore, the studios proposed will have two tenants. The residents will need a vehicle and should be required to supply the required two parking spaces per unit. She noted that she did not notice handicap spaces on the plans. She asked where the a/c units would be placed and if they will be buffered for the noise level.

John Richman noted that there would be heat pumps with small compressors on the roof. No vents on the roof. The units will sit behind the parapet walls, which will buffer the noise.

Ms. Shivone stated that she is living in her house for 35 years. She has tried on a number of occasions to request a stop sign on Highview, Lincoln and Oakland to no avail. The sight is diminished when a driver is making a right on Lincoln onto Oakland and travelling north. The worst intersection in the Village is Lincoln and Oakland. If the buildings do not have setbacks, this will make the intersection worse. The Board should try to make things better, not worse. In her opinion, this was a horrific plan.

Ms. Shivone added that Fisher Ave. is quite narrow and congested. She asked the applicant and Board to go back to the drawing board. If the applicant desires to build a building in our Village, require them to build something that fits into a neighborhood.

She noted that the applicant spoke about Blue Back Square in Hartford, Ct., which she says, is similar to Ridge Hill, in Yonkers. She voiced her concern that the applicant can chop up the retail space to be 200 sq. ft. each. If this were the case, 12 spaces would not be sufficient. The speed limit is 15 mph in that vicinity due to the childcare center.

She added that the residents do not support this project.

Chairwoman Ciaramella stated that any resident whom cannot make it to the meeting could write a letter to the Building dept., which will be forwarded to this Board.

**Commissioner Fang motioned to keep the public hearing open, was seconded by Commissioner Gorman and carried with a vote of 5 - 0.**

**Item #11** 16 Chestnut

Adjourned

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.

