

February 14, 2011

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

**Present:** Chairperson Ann Marie Ciaramella  
Commissioner Melba Caliano  
Commissioner Eric Fang  
Commissioner Antonio Leo  
Commissioner Tim Miller (arrived 8:10pm)  
Commissioner Sandy Reyes-Guerra

**Absent:** Commissioner Raymond Nerenberg

**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 – Jan. 18, 2011**  
**Item #2 18 Bronx Street Presentation**  
**Item #3 300 Columbus Ave. Site Plan**  
**Item #4 150, 160, 233 Main St. Return**  
**Item #5 Chestnut Street Adjourned**  
**Item #6 35 Bronx Street Adjourned**

**Item #1 Approval of minutes – January 18, 2011**

**Commissioner Leo motioned to approve the minutes from the Regular Meeting – January 18, 2011 was seconded by Commissioner Fang.**

**Discussion: Commissioner Reyes-Guerra reported a correction.**

**Commissioner Reyes-Guerra motioned to approve the amended minutes, was seconded by Commissioner Leo and carried by the Board with a vote of 4-0, with Commissioner Caliano abstaining due to her absence.**

**Item #2 18 Bronx Street Presentation**

Mr. Stanziale, architect for the applicant, thanked the Board for allowing his presentation this evening. 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 be a small terrace with a railing. The house next door has a similar dormer on the second floor. 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 reduced the FAR. The footprint will stay the same and there will be no extension on the first floor.

Commissioner Fang requested additional photos for a complete representation of the surrounding area.

Chairwoman Ciaramella asked the applicant to return to the Planning Board's workshop on March 1, 2011 to discuss the plans further.

**Item #3 300 Columbus Ave. Crestwood Station Plaza LLC Site Plan**

Mr. Anthony Nester, representing Crestwood Station Plaza, LLC., stated that this site was changed from a Business zone to a Business/Residential zone by the Board of Trustees in Sept. 2010. The site sits at the intersection of Lincoln Ave. and Columbus Ave. It is currently Rick's Auto and Getty station. The plans submitted are to build a 3- story condominium building. It will have 26 residential units with 3600 sq. ft. of professional office space. He added that the Board requested that the building be realigned which was changed in the new amended plans. In addition, a second form of egress for the parking lot was added which exits onto Lincoln Ave. The vehicles using the Lincoln Ave. exit would have to make a left turn only. This was done as a good neighbor gesture as some residents voiced their concern regarding the additional traffic going through their neighborhood. The left turn would keep traffic on Columbus Ave.

Chairwoman Ciaramella voiced her concern regarding safety as vehicles exiting on to Lincoln Ave. would have a limited view of the sidewalk and street due to the building situated right on the property line. This is a safety issue for pedestrians as well as other vehicles.

Mr. Nester indicated that a traffic study was conducted by the applicant, which concluded that this small parking area would not warrant a second form of egress. It was done only because the Planning Board requested it.

Commissioner Fang requested that the traffic engineer be present at the next meeting to present the traffic study at length. He also voiced his concern regarding the zero set back on Lincoln Ave.

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra asked the applicant if they considered making each exit as a one-way only; one as an entrance and one as an exit. She also noted that there was a large amount of asphalt in the parking area. She asked the applicant to try to provide more green space, additional shade trees and maybe use pavers in lieu of asphalt.

Mr. Nester noted that there are two required parking spaces per apartment. The snow removal would be taken care of by the property owner. There are some green spaces to pile up the snow. He also added that there are now an additional 9-metered parking spaces on Columbus Ave. due to this project.

Commissioner Fang noted that this is a pivotal location at the plaza and would like the applicant to consider the shallow depth of the commercial space proposed.

(Commissioner Miller arrived 8:10)

Commissioner Reyes-Guerra voiced concern regarding the crosswalk across Columbus Ave. This crosswalk needs to be discussed further.

Commissioner Fang asked the radius of the corner. It is an active pedestrian intersection and pedestrian safety is a concern.

Mr. Nester noted that the radius was 35ft., which is the minimum for truck traffic.

Mr. Frank Fish, Village Consultant, indicated that the memo he sent to the Board today reviewed the EAF and the secondary access. He agreed with the traffic study, which concluded that the secondary access was unnecessary for this size parking lot. He noted that if the Board and the applicant are satisfied with the second access, his concern is the required left turn only. This will result in the vehicles backing up on Lincoln. Both turns should be allowed. In addition, there will be a limited amount of vehicles during peak hours, with a project of 26 units. He noted that the building facing Lincoln Ave. should be set back 2 – 3ft. from the property line for visibility.

Mr. Fish added that the concern regarding additional green space in the parking lot can be examined by reducing the required 9ft. x 20 ft. parking space to 9ft. x 18 ft. for all the tandem parking spaces found in the lot. There really is no need for the tandem design to be 40ft. in length. This reconfiguration would add several feet to the lot for green space.

**Commissioner Reyes-Guerra motioned to open the public hearing at next month's meeting was seconded by Commissioner Leo and carried by the Board with a vote of 6-0.**

**Item #4 150, 160, 233 Main St. Return**

Mr. William Null attorney for the applicant stated that the previously approved plan was for 88 units and the new plans are for 129 units. The revised plan is the same footprint, same FAR and the commercial property has been reduced from 18500sq.ft. to 2015 sq. ft. with the possibility of expanding the space to 2500 sq. ft. More than half of the proposed units are studio and one-bedroom apartments.

Norman Cox, architect for the applicant noted that most of the characteristics from the original application have been preserved. The plans maintain the Main St. urban design. The roof of the parking garage cannot be visible from many locations surrounding the project. There is a 30 ft. grade in the elevation on this site, which allows the applicant to conceal the parking and create a landscape deck over the parking garage.

Building #3 will have retail space on the first floor. This building has been pulled forward a bit towards the sidewalk. The retail space will measure 2015 sq. ft. This space may be expanded by incorporating the ground level of the third townhouse which when added, will total 2500 sq. ft. of commercial property.

The townhouses have been slightly revised to lift them off the street level by adding a stoop in front of the door. This makes the space more private.

Mr. Tom Carmen, landscape architect from the firm of Melillo and Bauer, indicated that the sidewalk on Midland Ave and Main Street will have a brick band to keep with the design on Main St.

In front of Bld #1, there will be decorative pavement at the lobby entrance.

Bld#2 will have the landscape deck above the parking garage with a water feature, outdoor living room, outdoor fireplace and barbeque grill. There will be drainage layers and an abundance of viable plants. This building will also have decorative pavers at the lobby entrance. Courtyards with a bench for pedestrians and all handicap accessible. Shrubs and rain gardens within the courtyards.

Bld#3 will house parking below and behind the building. The parking area will be buffered with green space and shrubs. There will be decorative pavers in front of the retail space.

For the entrance to the park across the street, an open-air pavilion is proposed with entrance structures, benches along Main St. and possibly a stonewall with a sign 'Welcome to Tuckahoe'.

Graham Trelstad, representing AKRF, the planning firm, prepared the EAF for this project. He presented his findings regarding the impact this project would have on the school system, using the Rutgers Planning Model, which is the industry standard model. In the previously approved plan, there were 88 units approved which would estimate 7 schoolchildren. The new revised plans are for 129 units, which would estimate approximately 17 students, spread throughout the 12 grades. Some of the new students would attend private schools. He researched data from 20 multi-family dwellings in the area including Viva Bene, Rivervue and 50 Columbus Ave., and his calculations found that there are .133 students per dwelling unit. His findings calculate that the project will generate approximately \$593,000 in property taxes, of which 55% go to the school district, for an amount of \$326,000 annually. With approximately 17 students at a cost of \$12,000 per student with 10% of the 17 students needing special education at a cost of \$44,000 per student, the number of students will cost \$268,000 annually for a net profit of \$58,000 for the school district from the project. He researched other new projects in the southern Westchester area and estimates that the tax rate will be \$4600 per unit for this project.

Commissioner Caliano asked how the school projects the number of students to be enrolled next year.

Mr. Trelstad did not know how the Tuckahoe School district predicts their enrollment. He noted that the information used was from the current enrollment. The 2010 data for this current year had an enrollment of 1050 students, which was a ten-year high. He noted that this project is rental properties only. He referred to the EAF for comparable sites most of which were condos. He stated that condos have a higher number of students per dwelling than rental properties. He also noted that Tuckahoe imports special need students on a tuition paid basis.

Mr. Frank Fish, Village Consultant, asked Mr. Trelstad to provide the Board with a fiscal impact study of these numbers to be reviewed in its entirety. He added that although the commercial space has been reduced from 18,000 sq. ft. to 2015 sq. ft., the number of residential units has increased. Commercial space increases traffic, while residential units increase the number of public school children. The applicant could look at increasing the commercial space again. In addition, a reduction in the number of 3 – bedroom units may reduce the number of children. He voiced his concern regarding the intersection of Midland Place and Main Street. There must be adequate signage to prevent a traffic jam blocking the intersection.

Commissioner Leo asked Mr. Trelstad to provide the data in the fiscal report regarding the formula used to calculate that each unit will pay \$4600 in taxes for a total of \$593,000.

**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.**

**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**

Dr. Julio Urbina, VP Tuckahoe Board of Education, noted that the data provided did not include layoffs and the population increase due to students transferring from private schools. The tax revenue needs to be sufficient to cover the cost to the school. His research indicated that the Rutgers Planning Model is skewed toward the benefit of the applicant. He used the Cohort Components model, which predicts more students. The data concluded that there would be 28 students with the cost of \$13000 per student, 15% of this population would need special education at a cost of \$41,000 per student for a total of \$312,000 + \$164,000 (special education costs) for a total cost to the school district of \$476,000. With a \$211,000 tax revenue, there is a gap of \$265,000 cost to the school. He noted that these figures from 2007-2008 are outdated and the true cost would be more. He compared the project to 100 Columbus Ave, which has 134 units with 47 students, and the public housing on Midland has 99 units with 49 children.

Dr. Urbina stated that he would like to work collaboratively to improve communication between the school district and the Planning Board. The school board was never notified about the previously approved plans of 88 units. Mr. Rafael Rivera from the School Board has offered to act as liaison between the School Board and the Planning Board.

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

Rafael Rivera, 12 Alta Drive, represented the Tuckahoe School Board and the Tuckahoe Innovation Committee stated that the EAF had only used one rental property in the 7 buildings that was analyzed. He noted that he corresponded with Mr. Raffiani regarding the cost of each rental unit. Studios - \$1600 per month, 1bd - \$3000, 2bd - \$4000, 3bd - \$4800 and 2bd townhouses between \$5000 - \$6000. The taxes will be based on the rental income, which may fluctuate. He stated that he is not against development as long as it benefits the school and the community. He requested that an independent report should be prepared with all the current data. He agreed to send his notes regarding his data to Bill Williams, Building Inspector for the Board to review.

Tammy Ehrenfeld 53 North Way, voiced her concern regarding who is the advocate for the residents. She reviewed the minutes from the past meetings and was perplexed as to why the impact on the school was not discussed at length. She said she is not against the development, but at what cost to the school

district. It was her opinion that the Village consultants seem to be advocates for the developers rather than the taxpayers.

Michelle Liscio 92 Stebbins Ave. reviewed the EAF and was surprised that the Planning Board did not question the data as to the number of students projected for the school district. She noted that there is one building in Tuckahoe with 15 units, which has 12 students. How can 88 units project 7 students? She noted that the project was granted variances for the original plans, which have changed dramatically. Ms. Liscio noted that she understands that the footprint will stay the same, but there will be significantly more units and less commercial space. She estimates that the project could produce 30 kids into the school system.

Joanne Cannale 3 Deerfield Ave. asked if the Planning Board conducted their own analysis of the data or do they just accept the report the developer submits? She noted that the traffic study conducted in 2007 for the original project was not done during the peak hours in Tuckahoe. In addition, she noted that the calculations found in the EAF water usage was 31,000 gallons of water per day for 88 units. The new plan for 129 units calculates that 30,200 gallons of water. She asked how the number of gallons reduced while the number of units increased. The waste predicted also decreased from 14.5 tons for the 88 units to 11 tons for 129 units. Ms. Cannale noted that the Board has requested a hazardous material report several times, which has not been submitted. She added that it was in the best interest of the Village to communicate with the school system, Police Dept. and DPW with information regarding a project this size.

Tony Buonocore, President of the Board of Education, questioned how the applicant can predict that the 17 students would be sprinkled throughout the 12 grades. Most young families move while the children are young and therefore will enter the Cottle Elementary School, which is tight already. He stated statistics regarding the school enrollment. The school must provide a school aide once the class size reaches 25, which cost approximately \$20,000. Once the class size reaches 30 students, a new class must open which would cost \$100,000 for the teacher. The Tuckahoe School admitted 67 new students this past year.

Mr. Buonocore will submit his data to Bill Williams, Building Inspector for the Board to review.

Michael Collins 21 Winslow Circle referred to the zoning code and noted that a proposed project must be analyzed regarding how it will potentially impact property values. The increase from 88 units to 129 units is substantial. The project now has a new development group. He noted that the Board granted a negative declaration under SEQR and asked the Board to revisit and check all the data again. He added that his concern is that this development does not hit the taxpayers in the pocketbook.

James Hanna 7 Clinton Place stated that he was in support of the project. He stated that the Rivervue has 83 units and 1 child attending the school; Tower Club 200+ units with 19 students; Gentry has 180 units with 11 students. He stated that the Village to be at its full potential, it needs this new development.

Joe Pregiato 126 Siwanoy Blvd. noted that there was a discrepancy in the tax per unit calculations. He was told at the workshop that the project would pay \$420,000 per year and now the number is \$590,000. He asked the Board to review the data. He voiced his concern as to whether the owner will be able to demand such high rentals. If not, what will happen to the projected taxes? The numbers that are projected should not be used to formulate the taxes. He noted that the building industry uses the Rutgers Planning Model because it makes the development look good for the community. He stated that he

conducted his own research with a different planning model, using the same data and calculated approximately 79 children.

One concern, Mr. Pregiato stated, was the additional cost to the Village regarding the Police Dept., Fire Dept., DPW etc. This project will add an additional 5% to the population of the Village. How can a surge this size not have an impact to the Village? Will the increase in population require an additional Police Officer? He added that the Village should require the developer to post signs to make the public aware of the plans.

Chairwoman Ciaramella stated that the Board is obliged to advertise the public meetings. Meetings are advertised via the agenda posted on the news, Channel 75 and at Town Hall.

Mr. Pregiato stated that he too will send his data to the Building Dept. for the Board to review.

Robert Casazza 77 Stebbins Ave. noted that the excellent reputation the Tuckahoe School system is one of the reasons new families are attracted to Tuckahoe. Most young couples with young children relocate and therefore will enter the Cottle Elementary School. He noted that it was his opinion that there is a serious lack of faith, and the residents do not trust the numbers submitted by the developer. He predicts that approximately 60 students may be the result of 129 units. He noted that the Rutgers Planning model was the model, which would predict the lowest number of students. He asked the Board to review the numbers again carefully.

Mr. Null, attorney for the applicant, stated that there have been quite a lot of comments from the public. He noted that he will provide the requested fiscal analysis to the Board. He stated that the project is for high-end, luxury rentals, not low income housing. The Rutgers study and other studies vary from community to community.

The last resident to speak noted that all parties have a responsibility to do the best we can for the children. He supports developing the property, but not at the children's expense.

**Commissioner Caliano motioned to accept additional comments in letter form to the Building Dept. within the next two weeks, prior to the next workshop, March 1, 2011. All comments will be reviewed and considered. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Reyes-Guerra.**

**Discussion: Mrs. Martino 6 Triangle Place, asked that the letter sent to the Planning Board from the Board of Education be read into the minutes. Bill Williams, Building Inspector, stated that the letter will be attached to the minutes.**

**Michelle Liscio stated that the tax assessor has not given the tax estimate to the developer. She asked the Board to follow up on the tax numbers.**

**Chairwoman Ciaramella stated that the Building Inspector will request the tax information for this project from the tax assessor. She told Mr. Raffiani that the tax assessor will require information from him regarding this project.**

**Motion was carried with a vote of 6 – 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.

**TUCKAHOE UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**Board of Education**  
29 Elm Street  
Tuckahoe, New York 10707

Anthony Buonocore, President  
Julio Urbina, Vice President  
Patrick Gallo, Trustee  
Sheree Raho, Trustee  
James Oliverio, Trustee

Karen A. Barros  
District Clerk

(914) 337-6600 x1262  
(914) 337-5735 Fax

January 28, 2011

Via Email ( [bwilliams@tuckahoe-ny.com](mailto:bwilliams@tuckahoe-ny.com) ) & Regular Mail

Tuckahoe Planning Board  
Village of Tuckahoe  
65 Main Street  
Tuckahoe, New York 10707

Dear Members of the Planning Board:

After careful review of the Glenmark project and a discussion with Mr. Phil Raffiani and representatives of Glenmark, we have significant reservations regarding the potential negative impact of this project. Our concerns include the impact on school enrollment and eventual costs to the District, which will exceed tax revenue.

Assuming that their student projections are valid, the data that Mirado Properties and Glenmark has used in making its projection is outdated and does not take into account the increased enrollment the District experienced in 2009 – 2010 nor the loss of 7.5 teachers due to budget cuts. Moreover, our recent kindergarten registration indicates that further growth is projected for 2010 – 2011.

Therefore, the excess capacity that Mirado Properties and Glenmark has assumed to exist in the District, in fact, does not. Finally, Mirado and Glenmark did not take into account the increase in the number, and costs associated with providing special education to approximately 15% of the 28 students projected.



The Tuckahoe Board of Education appreciates the community and economic development that has taken place in the village over these recent years and would consider supporting this project as long as it makes financial sense to the District. We ask that you give serious consideration to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Tuckahoe Board of Education

cc: Mayor John Fitzpatrick  
Tuckahoe Village Board  
Supervisor Anthony Colavita  
Eastchester Town Council  
Mr. Phil Raffiani, Mirado Properties