

Village of Tarrytown, NY

One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, NY 10591-3199
ph: (914) 631-1885

Planning Board Minutes 8/26/2013

Planning Board
Village of Tarrytown
Regular Meeting
August 26, 2013; 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Friedlander; Members Tedesco, Raiselis, Birgy; Counsel Shumejda; Village Administrator Blau; Village Engineer McGarvey;

ABSENT: Member Aukland, Secretary Bellantoni

APPROVAL OF THE MINTUES – July 22, 2013

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, and unanimously carried with one abstention by Chairman Friedlander, that the minutes of July 22, 2013, be approved as submitted. Motion carried.

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING – Bartolacci – 67 Miller Avenue

Peter Bartolacci, homeowner, addressed the board stating that they do not feel that they should be required to go through the planning board process for the work they wish to do in their back yard. They feel that neither the site plan approval nor the steep slope law applies. He raised their objection to the Village Administrator, Michael Blau and the Board of Trustees. He submitted those documents to be part of the Planning Board record.

Mr. Bartolacci said they are going to continue with the process until a determination is made on how they want to proceed. He stated that they will be submitting revised plans incorporating what was there originally and landscaping. Mr. Bartolacci said tonight he would like to get to the bottom of the most pressing issues, establishing the original height of the wall. He has pursued many, many avenues to verify the height. He feels they have come far beyond a good faith effort for something that should be on file in the Village Hall. Mr. Bartolacci proceeded to provide statements from residents to verify the height of the wall.

Brian Thompson, 57 Cedar Lane, Ossining, New York stated that he lived at 63 Miller Avenue until he was 23 years old. He said he did not know Mr. Bartolacci but happened to run into him at an event he was running in the Village. When Mr. Johnson saw his address, they began to talk about the neighborhood. When Mr. Bartolacci asked him if he remembers the wall in his back yard, he stated that he remembered it vividly. As a kid he climbed that wall many time. Mr. Thompson went into the back yard of Mr. Bartolacci's home where he saw the railroad ties where the wall began and rose from. He was very surprised to see how small the yard had become and shocked to see how much property was lost.

Counsel Shumejda asked Mr. Thompson for the timeframe when he used to climb the wall. Mr. Thompson said late 50's through the mid 60's.

Chairman Friedlander asked if anyone else would like to speak.

Espina Katsaras, 48 Van Wart Avenue, stated that she used to live at 48 Miller Avenue for about 40 years. She was in 67 Miller Avenue's back yard many times. She stated that the homeowner at the time always fixed it and it was very flat. She saw that it is now going down.

Mr. Robert E. Fedigan, 7 Woodrow Drive, Yonkers, New York read a statement on behalf of Geraldine F. Baldwin of 55 Riverview Avenue and Lin Schneider and Jeffrey Scott Voth of 64 Riverview Avenue. The statement is attached.

Mr. Fedigan made a personal comment to the board. He stated that during Hurricane Sandy he and his wife stayed with his sister-in-law, Geraldine Baldwin, for 11 days and at that time he was surprised with the abundance of wild life in her back yard.

Sandy Kotaras, 14 Miller Avenue, asked to explain what her mother, Espina Katsaras was trying to say in her because of her language barrier. She said she grew up at 68 Miller Avenue and her mother was friends with the previous owners of 67 Miller Avenue. She was trying to say that there was a retaining wall there and that is why the land was so flat. Each year they kept losing part of the yard because the soil would fall and the neighbor had to keep moving his bushes because of the erosion. There was a wall back there and the bushes would not have remained flat without it. She said her mother definitely remembers a wall; and with the erosion, without a wall there would be nothing back there now. Mr. Blau asked for a timeframe. Ms. Kotaras said from 1974 until the owner died which she thought was in 2010.

Chairman Friedlander said they went on several site visits to the property and spent extensive amount of time studying this; and no one disputes that there was a retain wall or the material. Some say 10', 12', 14', that is not the major issue. He said the Planning Board prefers a two-tier railroad tie wall rather than a masonry wall. A railroad tie wall is more aesthetically pleasing than a masonry wall. Our code says for safety you can repair an existing retaining wall in kind. Is in kind the same material or is there some leeway; he feels it means the same kind and the same material. The statements about the natural habitat, the environmental issues and steep slopes are a concern to this board. Since this is not new construction, we have a lot more leeway than if it were new construction. We do not know the the health and safety of the trees. The Planning Board recognizes that there should be a wall but the question is what kind of a wall.

Mr. Birgy asked Mr. McGarvey if this were new construction on steep slopes would we be entertaining it. Mr. McGarvey said probably not. Mr. Birgy feels this is a grey area because we wouldn't allow it today; but since this wall fell into disrepair, it has to be taken care of. He feels it sticks out and is not in conformity to the other properties in the neighborhood. Mr. McGarvey said that right next door to the right is a retaining wall which was put up several years ago and it is about 6-7' high in the back.

Suzanne Bartolacci, 67 Miller Avenue said in previous meetings there was a lot of discussion about the height of the wall. They have done extensive research to find out the original height of the wall but were unable to do so. They spoke with present and past neighbors of the property to speak about the wall in an attempt to confirm its original height. She asked if we come back with a revised plan made of railroad ties at the height we believe it was, will the Planning Board then say no we don't want it that high. She asked Mr. Birgy what he thought.

Mr. Birgy said the issue is if the wall was 20' then, that doesn't have tremendous bearing on our current situation. Things were done differently than; and if the wall had not fallen into disrepair, we would not be in this situation. You have other options. He does not believe that anyone would build at 20' railroad tie wall.

Mrs. Bartolacci said you can repair or replace what you had. We brought neighbors in to tell you what we once had.

Ms. Raiselis said what is relevant is that the wall is deteriorating, your yard is eroding, and the wall needs to be replaced. We don't have any evidence of the height except speculation.

Mrs. Bartolacci said if the yard is flat, the wall had to be that high.

Ms. Raiselis said she just doesn't like a block wall for the neighbors view. A stone or railroad tie wall is what she would prefer and feels it would be much more accepted.

Mrs. Bartolacci said just to clarify, last meeting Counsel Shumejda said if we wanted to do a railroad tie wall, we would not even have to come before the Planning Board; only to the Village Engineer; is that correct.

Counsel Shumejda said he did not say that but what he did say that you have a right under the code to replace in kind that wall.

Mrs. Bartolacci said that he then said is there proof of the original height of the wall; how high was that wall; what did you have. All of their research could not answer that so we brought people in to tell you how high it was. How do we answer that to the satisfaction of the Village Engineer?

Counsel Shumejda said it has been suggested several times that they come back with a sketch, not even a plan, for a two-tiered wall with landscaping and a stone facade; that is how to proceed.

Mrs. Bartolacci said to Counsel Shumejda that you stated that this is not new construction. She thought the steep slope ordinance was to protect against new construction so why are they here.

Counsel Shumejda said you have a wall made of railroad ties that has deteriorated. If you replace that wall with one railroad tie for another, that is replacement. You want to build a totally different wall which is made of mesa block with an average height of 9' and a length of 157'; that is new construction. You will be building something very different with lots of excavation and fill.

Chairman Friedlander said you are parsing words here. I was trying to summarize in a very generic way when that gentleman brought up that issue in that statement that most times they deal with steep slopes and waivers when it's new construction. There is a steep slope and they want to put something there, it requires a waiver. This is a very different animal. So there was some confusion. What I should have said was new projects in steep slopes when nothing is on the property already; there's something here already. He feels that the Planning Board will take a wall that replaces the wall according to Mr. McGarvey's opinion of height. The Planning Board prefers something else and asked you to present a sketch showing a two-tier wall with landscaping that will not offend the neighbors; to my knowledge that was never done. There are two choices:

- A railroad tie wall in kind submitted to Mr. McGarvey and it's done.
- Something more dramatic and useful, then submit what we recommended.

We will approve for a replacement for a replacement because that is what the code calls for. If there is something better that you like and the board recommended it or likes it, we are going to approve it.

Mr. Tedesco said on the two choices, the two-tiered wall should have aesthetically pleasing stone facing with landscaping for screening.

Mr. Bartolacci said the reason they are looking at the mesa block wall is because they do not want to be back here in 15-20 years from now with the same problem. Mesa block is much more expensive but we want to do it the right way. If we must do it another way, we will do that in order to preserve our property. He doesn't think it is the right solution for the Village of Tarrytown in the long run but will do it.

Mr. McGarvey said he needs engineered drawings, signed and sealed by a licensed engineer of how the wall will be constructed. He said just to summarize:

- They are going to keep the wall in the location where it is.
- He is going to try to the best of his ability to determine the height of where the wall was existing which has been determined that the left side is a little higher than the right side; 6-12'. He has final say and he will take it from there.

Mrs. Bartolacci said to Mr. McGarvey that he is going to determine the height of the pre-existing wall, taking into account what the neighbors said that the yard was flat and extended out. Mr. McGarvey said yes but no one gave a height. He said it is still very grey in his opinion, and he will do the very best that he can to determine the pre-existing height of this wall. He will tell the Bartolaccis and the Planning Board. You can proceed from there.

Mr. Bartolacci said he spoke to neighbors and he commented that the prior owner of the property said to him on one occasion that he took a step and 12 railroad ties came down. They are the ones you see scattered around below. They used to be stacked on what is there now. He said on the height of the original wall, if you have a relatively flat yard which bisects that wall, it shouldn't be that complicated to determine the heights. Mr. McGarvey said if it was not that difficult, we would not have been here for four months.

Chairman Friedlander said we only know the existing condition.

Mr. Fedigan said the present wall is between 4' and 5' and his sister-in-law said it has never been much higher since she lived there.

Mr. McGarvey said he will figure the existing slope from the row of shrubs and extend it out to determine the height.

Mr. Bartolacci asked if he is going to take the current pitch because the current pitch is quite steep. That back yard has sunk significantly; it was higher then the current pitch.

Mr. McGarvey said he will determine what the existing slope of the back yard from the back of the house to the row of shrubs to the top of the slope, from there he will extrapolate out to determine what the slope/height will be, will take that same elevation and extend it down and out and extrapolate it out to see what the height of the wall would have been if it had the same slope of the back yard.

Mrs. Katsaras reiterated that she used to site out in the yard and it was very flat.

The hearing was continued to the September meeting.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – JCC – 372 & 425 South Broadway

The Chairman read the following Notice of Public Hearing:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Planning Board of the Village of Tarrytown will hold a public hearing on Monday, August 26, 2013, at 7:00 pm at the Municipal Building, One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, New York, to hear and consider an application by:

*JCC-on-the-Hudson, Inc.
371 South Broadway
Tarrytown, NY 10591*

For a renewal of the April 24, 2011 approval with minor revision to the site.

The property is located at 371 & 425 South Broadway and is shown on the Tax Maps of the Village of Tarrytown as Sheet 1.140, Block 88, Lot 1-4. The property is in the LB (Limited Business) zoning district.

Documents are available for inspection in the Planning and Zoning Office. All interested parties are invited to attend and be heard. Access to the meeting room is available to the elderly and the handicapped. Signing is available for the hearing-impaired; request must be made to the Village Clerk at least one week in advance of the meeting.

By Order of the Planning Board.

Dale Bellantoni, Secretary

Dated: August 16, 2013

Peter Gisolfi, Architect introduced himself, Frank Hassad, Executive Director, and Diana Bate, Landscape Architect.

Mr. Gisolfi explained that the JCC previous received site approval for this project. They secured a demolition permit but did not start the work before the expiration of the Planning Board approval. They are back before the board to renew that approval and to present a few minor changes to the approved site plan.

Mr. Gisolfi explained those changes by showing the piece of the building to be demolished and the proposed new construction. He stated that the existing site plan had three curb cuts onto South Broadway, both were two-way. They are now proposing two curb cuts onto South Broadway, each one way only. Mr. Gisolfi further stated that they reduced the total impervious surface by 5%, designed all drainage to Village of Tarrytown specifications and received SWPPP approval.

Mr. Gisolfi said they are combining two properties into one. He showed the planning, parking and the additional green space created as well as a new playing field on the southwest corner of the property. They have ARB approval. He showed the glass corridor that will connect the two buildings and the road which loops around.

Mr. McGarvey said he only had one comment, which they have taken care of; and that was the widening of the loop road for the fire department.

Mr. Birgy asked if they are applying any energy conservation options. Mr. Gisolfi said they are doing one thing that will help. During the interior demolition, they found that the interior walls were less favorable than they expected so

they are furring out the interior surface of the exterior wall and fully insulating it which will have a significant impact. They are still looking at solar collectors on the roofs. They are making a green building as much as possible and what they are doing will certainly meet or exceed the current energy code.

Mr. Birgy asked if they are going beyond the New York State code with respect to insulation or heating. Mr. Gisolfi said right now they are not. They did not believe it will be LEED certified because that takes a lot of money, but it will be more sustainable than anything that was here before.

Mr. Birgy said they talked about a rain water collection system to irrigate the property. Mr. Gisolfi said we have a collection and detention system that meets the code on the property. We can look at it but we are really, really tight on the budget and he said it is not a condition of approval

Ms. Raiselis said there are deals right now that are pretty good; and on a building that size, you can reduce your electricity significantly. Mr. Hassad said they are talking with several purchase power vendors who have quoted them different prices. We are trying to find the space where the inverters are placed so that if we can't do it now, we can do it at some future point.

Mr. Birgy asked if it is a heated pool. Mr. Gisolfi said yes it is. Mr. Birgy asked if they have a system set up where the air conditioning heats it. Mr. Gisolfi said yes.

Chairman Friedlander asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak. No one responded.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Chairman Friedlander, to close the public hearing. All in favor; motion carried.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, that the Planning Board declare itself Lead Agency for the proposed project. All in favor, motion carried.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, that there will be no significant adverse environmental impacts as a result of this proposed action. All in favor; motion carried.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, to extend the site plan approval for the new JCC-on-the-Hudson community center, dated April 25, 2011 for a period of two years from the date of this meeting. This approval is subject to:

- Compliance with all the site plan conditions in the original site plan approval of April 25, 2011.
- Approval by the Building Inspector/Village Engineer in regard to any action he requires prior to the issuance of a building permit.

All in favor; motion carried.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – Wildev Group LLC – 124 Wildev Street

Chairman Friedlander stated that this applicant has been adjourned.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – DiNino – 27 Storm Street

The applicant was not present. The hearing was adjourned to the September 23, 2013 meeting.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – Coco Management – 45 North Broadway

The Chairman read the following public hearing notice:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Planning Board of the Village of Tarrytown will hold a public hearing on Monday, August 26, 2013, at 7:00 pm at the Municipal Building, One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, New York, to hear and consider an application by:

*Ed Coco
Coco Management
45 North Broadway
Tarrytown, NY 10591*

For the renovation of the existing building to a grocery store.

The property is located at 45 North Broadway and is shown on the Tax Maps of the Village of Tarrytown as Sheet 1.40, Block 14, Lot 2. The building property is in the RR (Restricted Retail) zoning district and the parking lot is in the M2 (Multi-Family) zoning district.

Documents are available for inspection in the Planning and Zoning Office. All interested parties are invited to attend and be heard. Access to the meeting room is available to the elderly and the handicapped. Signing is available for the hearing-impaired; request must be made to the Village Clerk at least one week in advance of the meeting.

By Order of the Planning Board.

Dale Bellantoni, Secretary

The certified mailing receipts were submitted and the sign was posted.

John Hughes, attorney for the applicant, introduced David Ball, architect and Mr. Coco, landlord. He then turned the presentation over to Mr. Ball.

David Ball of Monroe Architects stated that they have been work with Mrs. Greens for several months. The previous occupant was also a grocery store but because it was vacant for over six months, it became a change of use. He further explained that Mrs. Greens would like to use more square footage on the lower floor which was basically used for storage. He showed the site plan of the block and stated that John Canning of VHB has prepared a parking analysis. There are 67 spaces on site and they are proposing 73 spaces just by re-striping the lot. The buildings first level will have a small amount of sidewalk seating. Mr. Ball described the proposed set-up of the store stating that the back of the store on the first level there will be a meat and seafood department. There will also be a bakery and deli on the first level. He stated that they plan to install an elevator in the back of the store so that it will be completely handicap accessible. The ground level is planned for retail space for a small amount of groceries, vitamins and some organic bedding; all at a very good price. There will be a storage area, offices and a loading area on the lower level and a small seating area in the rear parking lot with a wooden enclosure.

Mr. Ball explained what Mrs. Green's is all about. He said they have beautiful organic food which is of excellent quality and very, very healthy.

Mr. Ball showed the elevations which are pretty much in kind and new signage and a canopy. They are proposing to replace the storefront glass which is single-pane in kind with double-pane glass. They plan to keep the original wooden doors and restore the floors to the original terrazzo flooring and expose the original brick walls. Mr. McGarvey asked if they are going to keep the fire separation between the other stores. Mr. Ball said yes and that they are separate buildings.

Mr. Ball said in the rear of the store at the lower level they are going to introduce a storefront look to entice people who park in the lot to come into the store.

Ms. Raiselis asked about the lot area and if there are dumpsters there now. Mr. Ball said the management company will be updated the dumpsters and there will be a compact there as well.

Mr. Birgy asked how they are going to address the outside of the building to make it more attractive. Mr. Ball said they are going to power wash and sand blast it and then paint it. They are placing all of the windows in kind with good quality commercial grade windows that should bring more light into the building. They are going to clean up the back of the building without changing what is there. The focus will be on the rear entrance. They are going to sprinkle the building which currently does not have sprinklers.

Mr. Tedesco said he read the engineer's report providing a rationale for the 20% reduction in parking but he was disturbed with the statement that the parking lot would be monitored to be used only by Pay Half, CVS and Mrs. Green's employees and customers. He said that lot is usually underutilized and others are accustomed to using it. If they will no longer be able to use it, it will cause a big parking problem on the street; a problem we should discuss and deal with.

John Canning of VHB stated that parking is a problem in Tarrytown and always has been. They now have 67 spaces and with re-striping they will have the required 73, provided you grant the 20% reduction. Tarrytown is a community where many people walk to the stores which eliminate less parking so that they believe the 20% is supportable. However, in order to make the parking requirements, we will have to be more restrictive in the control of the lot. It is not the intent of the owner to restrict the use of the lot as it has been during off-peak hours. The intent is to comply with the code in order to provide the required parking. We are willing to work with the board in the regard.

Mr. McGarvey asked how you restrict someone who is going to Mrs. Greens and then they go to another store in the area. How can you restrict that?

Mr. Canning said they have signs up now. The idea is to discourage the abuse of this parking. They do not want residents to feel that they can park there or have their guest park there. Mr. McGarvey agreed. Mr. Canning said it has working in the past; and if we need someone to monitor it during peak hours, we will do that.

Mr. Birgy said he would rather they put a sign up saying they can park after 9:00 p.m. Mr. Canning said it better to put a no parking sign up and not enforce it because then the risk is on the person parking. If they put a sign up saying its ok to park there at certain hours, it becomes the owner's risk.

Ms. Raiselis asked if they are only going to power wash the back of Mrs. Green's portion of the building or are they going to do the other sections as well because if they only do Mrs. Green's it not going to look so great. Mr. Ball said he believes they can work with the landlord on that. Ms. Raiselis said it is perceived as one building. Chairman Friedlander said even though they are looking at Mrs. Green's, they see it as one unit and if one looks terrible next to a new one, they all look terrible.

Mr. Blau asked how they are going to control the shopping cars in the downtown area. Mr. Ball said this is a bid unusual because they do not want them brought onto South Broadway although they would like the customers to be able to bring them to their cars in the parking lot. He said there are several options; a carrel in the front that the carts can't fit through and there carts with locks on the wheels that lock once it goes a certain distance from the store. We will work it out.

Chairman Friedlander asked about the trees in the front of the building and their condition. Mr. Ball said they are healthy. He asked that it be a condition of approval that the applicant has them check by an arborist and have them pruned.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, to close the public hearing. All in favor; motion carried.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, that the Planning Board declare itself Lead Agency for the proposed project. All in favor, motion carried.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, that there will be no significant adverse environmental impacts as a result of this proposed action. All in favor; motion carried.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, to approve the renovation and modification of the existing building at 45 North Broadway. This approval is subject to:

- Approval by the Building Inspector/Village Engineer.
- Approval by the Architectural Review Board for any proposed changes in the façade of the storefront and also to the rear entrance area.
- The applicant will provide improvements and screening to the dumpster area and will also repair and restripe existing parking areas.
- The applicant will have the trees along the front of the site examined by a certified arborist to determine their health and the need for any pruning of these trees which should be done by the applicant.
- Payment of any outstanding escrow fee prior to the granting of a building permit.
- Signing of the final site plan by the Planning Board Chair.

All in favor; motion carried.

CONTINUATION OF A PRELIMINARY HEARING–21 Wildey St., LLC– 21 Wildey St.

Chairman Friedlander stated that this application has been adjourned. They will be coming to the staff meeting with new plans, as per the Trustees.

PRELIMINARY PRESENTATION–Ridgecroft Estates Owner, Inc.– 154 Martling Avenue

Chairman Friedlander stated that this application has been adjourned.

PRELIMINARY PRESENTATION – EF International – 100 Marymount Avenue

Don Walsh, 245 Main Street, White Plains, New York, planning consultant introduced himself and explained that John Canning of VHB, traffic consultant and Stefan Yarabek of Hudson and Pacific, landscape architect will be contributing to this presentation.

He said this application was before this board about 19 months ago; and at the time there were several issues that need to be addressed. Since that time, there is new management. Phillip Johnson is the new Executive Director of EF. Mr. Johnson has brought in a team to look at many of the issues on the EF campus.

There are six items:

Number one is a site plan matter which involves the conversion of the Gaines Building, which is the Library building, into a dormitory, which under New York State Fire Codes, will need fire access around the building for the apparatus. The initial design was done by John Canning and will be reviewed by the Village. They have had discussions with the local fire department, the building department and Michael Blau. They have concerns about where two vehicles will be able to park. We may bring in a fire consultant experienced in high-rise which will be paid for by the applicant thought an escrow account.

Number two is another matter which may also need the expertise of the fire consultant and that is the esplanade construction which is located between Marion Hall and Rita Hall. It received approval about 19 months ago. We are going take a look at that and come back to the board with it.

Numbers three, four and five are all pending administrative permits but may need some tweaking on the site plan. We met with the building department for the repair of the wall on Neperan Road and the repair of the chain link fence in the area of the tennis courts; both will be added to the plan.

Number six is an ongoing discussion about cross walks, particularly on Marymount Avenue. We brought it to the police department and there is a meeting schedule later on this week with the police department and John Canning.

Lastly there are ongoing minor landscape issues on the campus.

Chairman Friedlander asked Mr. Walsh if he is familiar with the original approval regarding the number of people to occupy this campus and how this fits in with that. Mr. Walsh asked if it is a number that was set by the board.

Chairman Friedlander said it was a statement made by EF. He said the conversion is to house the high school students, correct. Mr. Johnson said at this time he does not know if it will house the high school students or the language school students. He said he has no knowledge of a set number of students on campus. There is a working number of 1,365 as far as students' beds on campus. Chairman Friedlander said that is the number you can have now. Mr. Johnson said the incoming class for September is 1,200; the number is higher for the summer, about 1,500 on campus and about 100 off-campus students. Chairman Friedlander asked if they drive to the campus. Mr. Johnson said no, they take public transportation or some host families drop them off.

Chairman Friedlander said he would like in writing the number of population on campus and how they get on and off the campus; the maximum number at the peak time; the average daily and monthly population and the number that will be add with the library conversion.

Chairman Friedlander asked if they have any plans for any of the remaining land for new construction. Mr. Walsh said no. Chairman Friedlander said you may want to contemplate this at this time because we may be setting limits on what we think the property should have because we do not want it overpopulated or over crowded for traffic and

health reasons.

Mr. Johnson said it's not as simple as adding 225 students; it will grow over time. If this is approved, it will allow us to close some dorms; but if we really care about safety and quality, we will have to shut them down for some time.

We could move students out of one dorm and into the new dorm while we renovate the old one. We would have a growth plan that is balanced with safety and quality requirements. Mr. Walsh said he brought up the esplanade because that is important for handicap accessibility. We will work with you as we look at an overall plan for the whole campus; this is a starting place.

Mr. McGarvey said, are you saying if and when the library is conversion is built, you are going to take the students out of one current dorm and renovate it, then move on to the next, etc. So you will not be increasing the number of students until these renovations are complete? Mr. Johnson said it will be a sequence and we can do that if we have a little bit more flexibility.

Mr. McGarvey asked the number of dorm there are in total. Mr. Johnson said five building that have student space; four dorms and one combined building. Mr. McGarvey asked the number of beds in each dorm. Mr. Johnson said in St. John's and Ursula combined there are approximately 630; in Gerard and Bulter together have approximately 400; and in Lugari there are approximately 300. Mr. McGarvey asked how many new beds will be added. Mr. Johnson said 225; 15-16%.

Mr. Brigy said he remembers that there was a number quoted in the original approval.

Mr. Blau stated that Mr. Johnson as the new director has been much more responsive than the previous director.

The last time this application was before this board the timing was not good because of the vandalism by some of the students. The Planning Board told them not to come back until the van is in place. Mr. Tedesco asked about the shuttle bus. Mr. Johnson said it is operating now with a nominal charge of \$1.00.

Chairman Friedlander said we all want to cooperate but there are issues that have to be resolved. The planning of the campus is very important. He does not remember that there was ever going to be a high school. High schools require a lot of acreage for different things.

Mr. Johnson said they are accredited by the State of New York and they are a private board school. Chairman Friedlander asked if New York State evaluated them for the requirement. There are different needs for high school and we have to consider that when going over the plans.

John Canning of VHB said they have done two studies. The looked at the fire access road requirements. The fire access road must lead to 150' of every portion of the outside of the building. It must be 20' wide and 26' wide for the aerial apparatus to deploy the stabilizers. We have provided this information to the project architect and they have come up with a plan that satisfies the fire access code and we would like to confirm that with the village administration. Looked at the potential traffic impact for this conversion by counting all of the driveway leading to the campus, number of taxi and others parking on Marymount Avenue, and looked at all location to see the pedestrian activity. The enrollment is approximately 1,200 and the number of car per hour at the peak hour entering or exiting the campus was 129, which was mostly staff. Most students walk or use the shuttle

Mr. McGarvey asked the number of staff. Mr. Johnson said approximately 150.

Mr. Canning said in the northwest corner of the campus there were 110 pedestrians mostly crossing to the Sport Building and then to Neperan or McKeel. With the increase enrollment there will be 10-15 in the peak hour which will not have a significant adverse impact. They recommend three new cross walks with striping. Ms. Raiselis said we need more than cross walks; the kids don't look. She said there are better and safer methods out there. Mr. Tedesco said when you come up Neperan to Marymount Road at a particular hour the sun blinds you. There could be a disaster if someone is in the crosswalk. Mr. McGarvey said we would need a written statement or report from the police department with their suggestions or recommendations.

Ms. Raiselis asked if there is any way there can be a place on campus where there could be a taxi stand because the taxis double and triple park on Marymount Avenue creating traffic issues. Mr. Johns agreed that there is a problem with the taxis. He also said they are looking into better lighting at the crossings.

Chairman Friedlander asked if the Police Chief looked at making Irving and Marymount one way. That should be include in there analysis. Mr. Blau said he did not think the residents in that neighborhood would be happy with one-way street. Mr. Canning said he will discuss it with the Police Chief.

Mr. Tedesco said that the landscaping used to be extraordinary but nature and lack of funds has deteriorated it. Now we would like to update it with native plantings, deciduous trees and evergreens.

Stefan Yarabek, landscape architect said he did a complete inventory of all the trees on campus. Ef is committed to replacing and revitalizing it. Trees will be replaced 4:1. The issues they will deal with are:

- Replacement of the wall on Neperan Road.
- At the intersection of Marymount Road and Neperan Road there will be a curved stone entry wall.
- An allee of Linden trees at the Sport Building.
- At Union Avenue the fence around the tennis courts will be replaced and the railroad tie retaining wall will be replaced with a geo-grid system with a stone veneer.

He presented the proposed plan with plantings and cleaning up of the entire area surround the campus.

Mr. McGarvey asked if the parking lot across from the administration can we get rid of it since no one used it because it will reduce the amount of water that runs down to the lake. Mr. Yarabek said he cannot say that but it should be looked at in their evaluation.

Mr. McGarvey asked how many parking spaces on campus. Mr. Canning said probably 185-200 is his guess. Mr. McGarvey said you have approximately 150 staff. Mr. Johnson said that lot is for the cafeteria and service staff mainly. He said parking depends on what is going on at any particular time of the day. Mr. McGarvey said he would like to reduce the impervious surface if possible. Mr. Johnson said he can provide an inventory of all of the parking areas. Ms. Raiselis said it would be good if that impervious surface could go away. Mr. McGarvey said you have to take into consideration that with an increase in students there will be an increase in service population.

Mr. Walsh said that concludes there presentation and they will take all of their thoughts and suggestions into consideration. Chairman Friedlander said if they have additional information or changes, they should come to the next staff meeting, which will be held on September 12, 2013.

Ms. Raiselis said to include any energy saving systems that you may want to include in the year to come.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis, and unanimously carried, that the meeting be adjourned – 9:30 p.m.

Dale Bellantoni
Secretary

