

March 15, 2011

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

**Present:** Chairperson Ann Marie Ciaramella  
Commissioner Raymond Nerenberg  
Commissioner Melba Caliano  
Commissioner Eric Fang  
Commissioner Antonio Leo  
Commissioner Tim Miller  
Commissioner Sandy Reyes-Guerra

**Also in Attendance:**

John Cavallaro Village Attorney  
Bill Williams Building Inspector  
Frank Fish Village Consultant  
Jim Pinto Village Consultant

Chairwoman Ciaramella announced the evening's agenda as follows:

**Item #1 Approval of minutes – February 14, 2011**  
**Item #2 35 Bronx Street Return**  
**Item #3 Chestnut Street Return**  
**Item #4 18 Bronx Street Site Plan**  
**Item #5 1 Midland Place Architectural Review**  
**Item #6 40 Midland Place Site Plan**  
**Item #7 Crestwood Station Plaza LLC -  
300 Columbus Ave. Return**  
**Item #8 150, 160, 233 Main St. Return**

**Item #1 Approval of minutes – February 14, 2011**

**Motion by Commissioner Reyes-Guerra Leo to approve the minutes from the Regular Meeting – February 14, 2011 was seconded by Chairwoman Ciaramella and carried by the Board with a vote of 6-0, with Commissioner Nerenberg abstaining due to his absence.**

**Item #2 35 Bronx Street Return**

Mr. Gary Spilatro, architect for the Eastchester Child Development Center indicated that this was a previously approved project, however, there was an error found when the survey was completed. As a result, some minor changes will be made to the application. The trash will be stored in a Rubbermaid container and placed in a container shed, and brought to the curb for pick up. The ramp will now be in line with the left side door and with the curb cut. The stairs in the

back that run to the concrete sidewalk will be used for emergency use only. The trees will be relocated correctly on the site. The retaining wall along the foul line of the field will have a black chain-link fence on top, which together, the height will measure 13ft. to 13.5 ft.

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra offered a suggestion that the applicant continue the sidewalk that the children use to exit the school and proceed to the playground. If the sidewalk is not continued, it was her opinion that the school children will take the shortcut and eventually there will be a dirt path through the front lawn. She also asked about the measurement of the pedestrian curb cut.

Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that the applicant must present the application before the Village Board for a curb cut approval.

Commissioner Fang voiced his concern regarding the chain-link fence. The area is a high visibility public space and an 8ft. x 200ft. black fence is a concern.

Mr. Spilatro stated that this is indeed a ball field and for the players to see the ball, the applicant cannot change the color of the fence. The retaining wall is necessary for the water retention inside the parking lot. The fence on top of the retaining wall starts at 5ft. 6in. There will not be wind guards as there is the potential that they will be pulled out over time.

Commissioner Leo offered the idea of using piers to break up the monotony of the black chain-link fence.

Mr. Spilatro added that this is the first time the fence has been an issue with the Board. He asked that the fence be part of the landscape approval.

**Commissioner Caliano motioned to accept the application as presented tonight excluding the fence, which will be discussed during the landscape approval. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Leo.**

**Discussion: Commissioner Reyes-Guerra asked that the path from the front door to the side of the building to the playground be reviewed again as part of the landscape approval. Motion was approved with a vote of 7 – 0.**

**Commissioner Caliano offered an amended motion which states that the Board has concerns regarding the chain-link fence; and the sidewalk on the eastern most exit doorway to the playground be extended. These two concerns will be addressed during the landscape approval.**

**Commissioner Miller motioned to accept the amended motion, was seconded by Commissioner Leo and carried with a vote of 7 – 0.**

**Commissioner Caliano motioned to adopt a negative declaration pursuant to SEQR. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Leo and carried by the Board with a vote of 7 – 0.**

**Item #3 Chestnut Street                      Return**

Anthony Rizzo, representing the owner, stated that this application was for two proposed homes.

Commissioner Leo indicated that there is an issue with having one parking space in the driveway. The plans must be revised to have two tandem parking spaces inside the garage. No vehicle in the driveway.

Mr. Venice, owner of the properties, stated that he was confused as to how the code should be interpreted regarding the vehicles parking in the driveway.

Mr. Rizzo noted that the plans would be revised to show both parking spaces in the garage.

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra noted that she visited the site and was concerned about the possible destruction of 5 mature trees. She stated that if the applicant flipped the house on the right, and put the driveway on the other side of the house, there could be a possibility of preserving the one tree on the property line. In addition, if the applicant switched the plans to a common center driveway for the proposed house on the left, the applicant could preserve the mature tree near the foot of the driveway. This will be good for the environment as well as resale value of the property.

Mr. Rizzo stated that he would do everything possible to preserve the mature trees. The foundation must be dug and the roots may be disturbed. He will determine the stability of the trees while the excavation process is happening.

Chairwoman Ciaramella stated that the applicant must consult with the DPW to decide if the trees are viable or not.

**Commissioner Reyes-Guerra motioned to accept the application as presented tonight with the following conditions, that the applicant makes every effort to protect the trees and to examine the landscape and put in some significant give back for the trees in the front yard. In addition, the applicant must make sure the stability in the rear of the property is examined for drainage purposes. If there is no grading in the back corner, that soil should be protected as well. This motioned was NOT seconded by any board member.**

**Chairwoman Ciaramella asked if there was another motion. The Board members agreed that the applicant must return with an amended site plan to show the correct placement of the parking.**

**Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that this motion did not pass. She asked the applicant to return next month with plans that show the correct parking with both vehicles in the garage. The plans submitted must be correct and complete and the trees should be clearly located on the site plan.**

**Item #4 18 Bronx Street                      Presentation**

Mr. Stanziale, architect for the applicant, noted that he presented these plans last month. He noted that the Zoning Board was concerned about the aesthetics and requested that the applicant present this project before the Planning Board for its recommendation. The plans submitted are to reconfigure the interior of the second floor of this single-family dwelling. The proposed plans are to expand the full bath by punching out the house to accommodate for the expansion. The punch out will look similar to a dormer and the opposite side will have a small terrace with a railing. Due to the non-conformity of the house, the applicant has pulled the addition back 2ft. to allow for a small shed roofline, which will soften the addition, and reduce the front yard set back variance. This 2ft. reduction has also reduced the FAR. The footprint will stay the same and there will be no extension on the first floor. The exterior of the house will have beige siding and new windows with 6in. window castings. The roof will be replaced and will match the new roof on the small extension. He presented pictures from other houses in the area with similar dormers. He noted that all the materials were presented at the workshop and he was not aware that they needed to be presented this evening.

Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that the applicant must leave samples of the materials with Bill Williams, Building Inspector so when inspections are being conducted, he has samples of the approved materials.

**Commissioner Caliano motioned to accept the application as presented tonight with the exception that the applicant provides samples of the materials to Mr. Williams. Commissioner Nerenberg seconded the motion and was carried with a vote of 7 – 0.**

**Item #5 1 Midland Place                      Architectural Review**

Mr. Martin Hero representing the McGrath family noted that the Zoning Board requested that the plans be presented before the Planning Board for recommendation. The single family house sits on a very narrow lot. Mr. Hero submitted pictures of other homes in the area. The proposed home will sit 32 ft. in height from the curb cut.

Commissioner Leo noted that the lot was quite narrow for the proposed home.

Commissioner Fang voiced his concern regarding the porch.

Mr. Hero noted that the specific issue from the Zoning Board was that the house could not encroach the front yard. The current house is 16ft. wide and the applicant cannot widen the house.

Mr. McGrath, owner of the property, noted that he currently has a two-story home with a front porch. He would like to add a second bedroom. The Zoning Board has confined the plans to not encroach the front yard. He stated that he would be happy with a two-bedroom house with a front porch, rather than build up and create a three-bedroom house with no porch.

Commissioner Fang noted it comes down to front yard vs. height.

Mr. Hero stated that the original plans proposed a 12ft. porch, which would leave an 8ft. front yard.

Commissioner Caliano noted that the Planning Board could recommend that the Zoning Board reconsider the front yard setback variance in lieu of the height variance.

Mr. McGrath noted that there is no variance required for the height.

Commissioner Leo asked the applicant to consider a smaller porch than 12 ft.

John Cavallaro, Village Attorney, noted that the applicant should re-present the original plans and the adjusted plans to the Planning Board at the next workshop.

**Item #6 40 Midland Place                      Site Plan**

Mr. Leonard Brandes, architect for the applicant, indicated that this application is for a change of use from a storage facility to storage and factory use. The building has existed for one year. The building has its own driveway. The plans are to convert it to a workshop to produce wood working products. The finishing and chemicals will be done at another site. The building currently has one parking space with four parking spaces inside. There is very little space in front of the building and all four vehicles will be parked inside.

Chairwoman Ciaramella asked about a ventilation system for the vans parked in the garage.

Mr. Brandes noted that the vans would park in the spaces, just like a garage. The vehicles will not be running, there is no need for a ventilation system. The facility will have a dust collection system, which will collect all the dust from the wood cutting machines. The back of the building is underground. There is 12in. of concrete on the sides of the building. Noise will not be a factor. There is also a 6in. slab of concrete between the floors of the building.

Commissioner Caliano asked about hazardous materials.

Mr. Brandes noted that all finishes would be administered off site.

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra asked if there would be any changes to the exterior of the building.

Mr. Brandes stated that there would not be any changes to the exterior of the building.

**Commissioner Nerenberg motioned to accept the application as presented tonight. Commissioner Fang seconded the motion and was carried with a vote of 7 – 0.**

**Commissioner Caliano motioned to adopt a negative declaration pursuant to SEQR. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reyes-Guerra and carried by the Board with a vote of 7 – 0.**

**Item #6 300 Columbus Ave. Crestwood Station Plaza LLC Site Plan**

Mr. James Ryan, representing the applicant, noted that the plans were fully compliant with the code and the Board of Trustees has issued a negative declaration pursuant to SEQR. He noted that the plans submitted have a single access to Fisher Ave. The second access on Lincoln was studied and reviewed and was warranted unnecessary. The parking is fully compliant with 70 parking spaces. These plans were created in compliance with the Master Plan vision.

Mr. Richard Pearson, Traffic Consultant conducted a traffic study on August 2, 2010 and presented his analysis to the Board of Trustees and the Village consultants. The counts were taken on a weekday between 7:00am - 9:00am and 4:00 pm – 6:00pm. There were 39 trips in the peak am and 21 trips in the peak pm. The proposed site is projected to generate lower volumes as most residents will walk to the train. The projection is for 11 trips in both the am and pm.

The proposed plans for the one driveway will operate well. There is no need for a second driveway. The intersection of Columbus and Fisher has a pre-timed traffic light with more green time given to Columbus. The village should consider making an adjustment to give an additional 5 seconds to Fisher. This small amount of time will reduce the queue on Fisher. A left hand turn is done very seldom, every 20 minutes.

Chairwoman Ciaramella voiced her concern regarding the safety of the vehicles exiting the property and making left hand turns.

Mr. Pearson noted that there is such low volume, it is not a safety issue. There is excellent sight view for the vehicle exiting. The applicant could remove one more parking space on the street to enhance vision if need be. There is a net gain of 8 metered parking spaces in Crestwood with this proposed project.

Mr. Frank Fish, Village Consultant requested that the Trustees review the EAF dated Oct. 2009 and revised Jan. 2010. He submitted a copy of his letter sent to the Board of Trustees recognizing them as Lead Agency. He also included the negative declaration made by the Board of Trustees on Sept. 13, 2010. He added one comment, that the impervious surface in the parking lot be examined and that the applicant reverse the plans and put the pavers in the parking spaces with asphalt in the center. This plan will create more pervious surface.

Georges Jacquemart, Traffic Engineer noted that he visited the site and agrees with the conclusion that only one driveway is needed. The other exit would be a safety issue with pedestrians as there are not ideal conditions at that location. This proposed project will produce low volume, as most residents will take the train. The vehicle volume generated from this site will be less than half of a typical development in a suburban area because of its proximity to the train station. A vehicle making a left turn does not happen too often. The advice to change the timing of the traffic light will help with the queue. The visibility is very good at the exit. The plans have more parking than needed.

Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that she was not too concerned with volume as she was with safety. The reason the second egress was discussed was to prevent left hand turns. Low volume may be more of a hazard as the pedestrians may not be used to this exit.

Mr. Jacquemart noted that safety, not volume, was an issue with the Lincoln exit. There is low visibility due to the grade.

Commissioner Fang asked if the grade was changed and the plans revised, the safety issue would change.

Mr. Jacquemart noted that the exit on Fisher is safe due to the good visibility, low volumes and that Fisher is not a high speed traffic road.

Commissioner Fang asked specific questions regarding the traffic study. The copy presented to him was difficult for him to read.

Commissioner Nerenberg noted that this was a business area and double parking was an issue. He noted that he preferred the access to be right hand only and to have a second access.

Mr. Jacquemart noted that double parking is an enforcement issue, but the additional 8 parking spaces in the village may alleviate the problem. He added that he would recommend against the second driveway. If the village wants to be pedestrian friendly, the conflict with the second driveway is not safe.

Commissioner Fang noted that the area might evolve into more mixed use zoning which is discussed in the Master Plan and voiced his concern regarding how it may affect the access in this area.

Mr. Jacquemart noted it will be more village-like, more pedestrian friendly, a safe location and it will not affect the general public.

Mr. Fish added that the Trustees are currently examining the area from Lincoln, Oakland, Columbus and both sides of Fisher for more office space. The zoning could change to mixed use with business and some residential, which will generate less traffic. A business/residential area generates less traffic than in a commercial area, in terms of overall trip generations.

Commissioner Fang asked if Fisher Ave would be used as an exit for future projects.

Mr. Jacquemart noted that a retail center would have more than one driveway. With this project, the pedestrian traffic is more important and the sidewalks should have as little interruption as possible.

Commissioner Fang questioned the applicant about the submission displaying the massing study. He noted that he wanted to view the building in context with the other surrounding buildings and with the character of the sidewalk. The elevation submitted does not show this. This is a very prominent area and he requested more visuals, which display the character of the building as it affects the adjacent buildings.

Commissioner Leo added that the Board would like to see a three-dimensional view of the building.

Chairwoman Ciaramella noted that Mr. Williams could show examples of three-dimensional views submitted by other applicants.

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra noted that she agreed with the recommendation given by Mr. Fish regarding the switching of the pavers with the asphalt in the parking lot. She added that a concern is snow removal and she recommended that the applicant use a heating element under the pavement.

Mr. Ryan noted that the current site is 100% paved and all the water is untreated. These plans exceed the requirements with the water being treated and the additional pervious pavement and green space. The snow removal will be taken care of as a general maintenance issue and a heating element will not be necessary. This lot will be like the Village parking lots.

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra proposed the idea to reduce the length of the tandem parking spaces to 18ft. She asked if the applicant would go back to the Zoning Board to request a variance to allow reducing the parking spaces, which would then allow the landscape to stretch in the rear of the property.

Mr. Ryan respectfully asked that the Board approve the project as presented and request, in good faith, that the applicant return to the Zoning Board post approval. The applicant has already asked for a reduction of the length of the tandem parking spaces and was denied. He would consider returning post approval and add it to the landscape portion of the application.

John Cavallaro, Village Attorney, stated that the applicant is fully compliant with the dimensions for site plan approval. The applicant wants to request the change in dimensions post approval as the application is fully compliant.

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra also added that the pedestrian crossing at Lincoln and Columbus is placed at a 90 degree angle from the front of the property and landscaping should be on both sides of the sidewalk.

John Cavallaro, Village Attorney, noted that the part of the landscape that the plans display, encroach into the public roadway. This must be done in coordination with the DPW.

Commissioner Fang asked about the radius of the Columbus Ave intersection.

Mr. Anthony Nester stated that it currently measures 50 degrees and will be reduced to 25 degrees. Trucks can turn with a 25 degree radius.

Commissioner Fang requested that the applicant return with a street section on Lincoln Ave., which displays alignment to the sidewalk, street and adjacent properties. The same should be provided for Fisher Ave. so the Board could understand the perspectives from eye level and from a pedestrian's standpoint. There is also concern regarding the alley; a three-dimensional picture from a pedestrian standpoint will be helpful. Commissioner Fang also added that if there is parking under the building facing Columbus, why not have parking under the building facing the Lincoln side? This would eliminate the uninterrupted asphalt and parking.

Mr. Nester stated that the parking lot is blocked by the adjacent buildings. Only the residents will see the parking. He added that it was the Board of Trustees decision to require 70 spaces.

The applicant will return next month.

**9:50 pm Commissioner Nerenberg motioned for a 5 minute recess. Commissioner Caliano seconded the motion and was carried unanimously by the Board.**

**10:05 Chairwoman Ciaramella motioned to reconvene the meeting, was seconded by Commissioner Caliano and carried unanimously.**

**Item #7 150, 160, 233 Main St. Return**

Mr. William Null attorney for the applicant stated that in responding to the comments made at the work session and by the residents at the prior meetings, additional documents were submitted to address the financial analysis, fiscal impact analysis, engineering information regarding storm drainage, and responses addressing the comments made by Mr. Pinto, including a memo regarding rain garden functions.

Norman Cox, architect for the applicant submitted a memo which describes the process of the rain gardens. The purpose of the rain gardens is to improve the quality of the run off before it proceeds to the ground. There will be three rain gardens, which will absorb one-third of the runoff from the buildings. It is a shallow depression built over an absorbent sub screen. The water is directed to the depression. Most storms generate less than 1in. of rain water. For less than 6in. of water, it is designed to infiltrate the water in 1 – 2 days. For more than 6 in. of water, the water will travel to a retention section. These rain gardens are very attractive gardens.

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra noted that she likes the aspect of the rain gardens but requested photos of similar installations.

Mr. Cox stated that he would provide the photos. He added that the green roof over the garage is intensive as it will be more than 4in. thick and is very good at retaining storm water.

Mr. Null noted that the application is for 129 units, but due to the concerns of the residents, the applicant has eliminated the 11 proposed three-bedroom units. The application now has 70 one-bedroom units, 59 two-bedroom units and 3 two-bedroom townhouses.

Ms. Nanette Bourne, reviewed the school and fiscal impact study. The study was submitted to the Board, which included costs of fire, police, school etc. She indicated that the most common school generation model is the Rutgers, which gives a snapshot of the school generation rates, and is based on the 2000 Census data. Statistically, the drawback is that it takes into account the urban development of NYC. The primary data of the study includes the communities of Eastchester, Tuckahoe and Bronxville school districts with comparable projects. Ms. Bourne described a similar project in Tuxedo, NY. The town questioned the results of the Rutgers data and conducted a validation on their own. The school generation came out approximately the same as the Rutgers.

This project, which will have 129 units and should generate between 17 – 19 school aged children. She noted that she worked on the EAF for the Rivervue project 10 years ago. The estimated school aged children were 14 – 16 children. In fact, there are presently fewer than 5 children residing at the Rivervue. It was her experience that the number generated will most likely be overestimated. It was her conclusion that there will be enough money for the fire, police and school etc. There is a net positive for the community as a result of the fiscal impact study as shown in detail in the expanded EAF report submitted.

Chairwoman Ciaramella stated that she asked Mr. Williams to contact the tax assessor to begin the tax projection phase. She asked Mr. Raffiani if the tax assessor has spoken with him regarding the projected taxes.

Mr. Raffiani stated that the tax assessor has not gotten in touch with him.

Mr. Null noted that the applicant has submitted the information requested to the Dolph Rothfeld consulting firm to be examined. He added that the plan will be less impervious than what was previously built on the site.

Chairwoman Ciaramella the information submitted to the Dolph Rothfeld firm is very important for a site plan approval.

James Pinto, Planning Board Consultant noted that he received an electronic copy of the proposed site plan and asked the applicant to send him a full size site plan and to Bill Williams, Building Inspector as well. He will continue the analysis of the project.

**Chairwoman Ciaramella announced that this meeting is now open for public comment on Glenmark Property submission. Members of the community are invited to make comment. They are to give their names and addresses. Each person commenting will be given 5 minutes to comment.**

**Please note that this portion of the meeting is restricted to comment. It is not a conversation or a question and answer session. The goal is to hear your comments and concerns. The Board will first hear from residents who did speak at last month's meeting.**

**We, the Board members, welcome your comments, which will be given serious consideration. Be assured of that.**

**Thank you for your cooperation and respect for this process.**

### **Public Comments**

Michael Lockhard 385 New Rochelle stated that he and his wife have two children in the Cottle school. He does not want the increase in class size and taxes. If the project gets approved every homeowner will be affected. He voiced his concern that the outgoing mayor was using the one-time fees for this project to balance the budget and that town attorney did not send the information to the school. He added that 'common sense' tells us that the project will produce more than 17 children. The applicant can inflate the rent projection to inflate the tax income to the town and then get the taxes reduced through a tax

certiorari if the building is not fully occupied. Mr. Lockhard added that the outgoing mayor wants to claim that he did not increase taxes.

Ed Steube Mt. Vernon resident noted that he was in favor of this application. He and his wife are in their 60s and are very interested in moving to a type of place like this project. He claims that there are many couples like him and his wife with grown children, which could be potential customers.

Jeff Meyers, 16 Terrace Place noted that he was before the Board regarding the JUMA project. He stated that the intersection at Midland and Main St. cannot accommodate the increase in the volume of traffic. It would be extremely difficult to make a left hand turn onto Midland from Main and from Main onto Midland. There will be a need for a traffic signal at this intersection. The Main St. corridor is already saturated with dwelling units. The Salerno's project will have numerous units. The Village of Tuckahoe is desirable because of its schools. He added that the builder has done beautiful work on Main St. He would like the project to be scaled back to the original 88 units.

Anthony Lore Wallace St. noted that he was in favor of this application. The Village has lost revenue with the destruction of many, multiple family homes on Columbus Ave. and with many manufacturing companies moving out of Tuckahoe.

Stephen Pagnotta 21 Crawford St. stated that he lives in Tuckahoe with his family and is very nervous about the project. The 88 units or 129 units are scary. The school is full and is concerned if it generates more than 18 children. He voiced his concern regarding the proposed rents. He noted that there are empty apartments in the area. He noted that the first thing a potential buyer looks at is the school.

Andrew Seney 28 Jefferson Place stated that he was in favor of this project. Mr. Raffiani has fixed up Tuckahoe with beautiful buildings and this building will look nice as well.

Dominic Cesarini noted that he owns a business on Main St. This development will be good for the surrounding businesses with the addition of pedestrian traffic. It will help keep people in the Village.

Al Kawer 38 Country Club Rd. Eastchester noted that he was a property owner and a business man and was very concerned about the sales tax, school tax and property tax. He added that most projects have been a plus for the school. He asked the Board to approve the project.

Charles Cinquemani 252 Marbledale Rd., added that he was in favor of the project. The proposed green roof and rain gardens were good for the environment. As a realtor in the area, it was his opinion that the rental market is in demand right now. This project will be good and will make that area of Tuckahoe look better.

Vito Catania 203 Dante Ave. noted that he trusted the Board to do the right thing. This project will be advertised which will bring potential buyers into Tuckahoe for future home buyers. He stated that he was against the use of building fees to balance the budget. He asked all residents to attend the Village Board meetings.

Dr. Julio Urbina, VP Tuckahoe Board of Education, stated that the residents are in favor of embracing economic development, but are very concerned as to whether the resources will be there to cover the costs of the school aged children. He voiced his concern that the numbers just do not add up. He noted that the projected numbers has been changed from 28 – 17 – 22 students. He calculated, with the

information given to him by Mr. Raffiani from the National Multihousing Council, that this project could possibly generate 37 students. He was concerned about the revenue verses the cost for this project. The THA offers only \$32,000 per year to educate 49 students.

Dr. Urbina submitted all his data for the Board to review.

Rafael Rivera, 12 Alta Drive, noted that he received an unsolicited report from Prudential Real Estate stating that the rental market for a single family house in Tuckahoe is approximately \$3618/mo.- \$3604/mo. in Eastchester and \$6000/mo. in Bronxville. The applicant projects a rental of \$4000/mo. for a two-bedroom apartment. This just does not seem correct. Some rental units in the area had to go with Section 8, which allows for \$1840 per month for a two-bedroom apartment. Mr. Rivera stated that he would be in favor of this project if it were the original plan of 88 units.

Mr. Rivera submitted all his data for the Board to review.

Joanne Cannale 3 Deerfield Ave. noted that apartments and condos in this area were not at full capacity. As a result, the property owners are filing tax certioraris. If the plans have eliminated all the three bedroom apartments, she asked to see the floor plan for the two-bedroom apartments. Her concern was that there may be plans for a den, which could be converted, to a third bedroom. She asked about the hazardous assessment in the EAF and if proper protocol was used to remove underground storage tanks and if proper permits were obtained. She stated that 168 Main St. had tanks removed on Feb. 1 and asked if they used the proper procedure.

Joe Pregiato 126 Siwanoy Blvd. noted that the soil being tested must be the soil found under the mounds and not the soil found on the top of the property. He noted that any more than 11 children would be a cost to the tax payers. He asked the Board to maintain the scale and small village like feel. Retail should be on the ground floor. He voiced his concern regarding the population density in Tuckahoe. He noted that the tax payers are all concerned about the schools and their investment. If the builder is incorrect, the tax payers pay while he files a tax certiorari.

Michelle Liscio 92 Stebbins Ave. stated that this project has so many changes, that it should be sent back to the Zoning Board for review. If this Board does not approve the 129 units, the applicant should return to the Zoning Board. She asked why the school was informed about the 88 units with the retail space. She noted that everyone appreciates the work Mr. Raffiani has done on Main St. She questioned who this new partner Glenmark was. The Glenmark website states that they are an investment company that specializes in affordable communities, they are not into the retail business. She asked the Board to review Glenmark. Ms. Liscio stated that she spoke directly with the tax assessor and noted that Mr. Raffiani must call him to discuss the projected taxes. She noted that the EAF for the Crestwood development seems much more detailed than the EAF for this project. She voiced her concern that the projected student numbers have been changed too many times for her to feel confident in their findings.

Michael Collins 21 Winslow Circle stated that this format where the residents cannot get answers to their questions is very troubling to him. The Board should require a new EAF to account for all the changes to the plans. The developer does not want this, but the Board should demand additional information.

Tammy Ehrenfeld 53 North Way, voiced her concern regarding an article written by Mayor Fitzpatrick dismissing the residents concern regarding this project. She likes the work Mr. Raffiani has done in Tuckahoe, but the Village is too dense. The project is too big.

Mr. Null, attorney for the applicant, stated that the residents can send in written comments to the Board to be part of the public record. He stated that the project is for high-end, luxury rentals, not low income housing. The rental estimates stated are not specific to this project. He noted that the consultants will continue to review the data and provide analysis.

**Chairwoman Ciaramella motioned to continue the public hearing. She notified the public that the next workshop will be on April 5 and the next public meeting will be April 14. Commissioner Fang seconded the motion and was carried unanimously with a vote of 7 – 0.**

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 at 11:30pm.