

VILLAGE OF CROTON ON HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES – TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2011

A regular meeting of the Planning Board of the Village of Croton-on-Hudson, New York was held on Tuesday, February 8, 2011 in the Municipal Building.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Kehoe, Chairman
 Bruce Kauderer
 Robert Luntz

ABSENT: Mark Aarons
 Fran Allen

ALSO PRESENT: Daniel O'Connor, P.E., Village Engineer

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 P.M. by Chairman Kehoe.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a) *Croton Community Nursery School – Lower North Highland Place (Sec. 67.20 Bk. 2 Lots 5, 6, 9, 25 [formerly Lots 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, & 25] – Application for a Preliminary Subdivision Approval – Request for an Adjournment*

Chairman Kehoe stated that, as in the past several months, the public hearing on this application for a preliminary subdivision approval is being adjourned until the next Planning Board meeting.

- b) *Dino Tsagarakis—383 South Riverside Avenue (Sec. 79.12 Blk. 2 Lot 27) – Application for an Amended Site Plan for renovations and addition to existing building, including improvements to exterior finishes and storefront, and site improvements.*

Mr. Eric Lam, architect, stated that he had updated the site plans to include details of lighting, concrete curb and gutter, support pole, asphalt paving with stone curb, ramp, and the garbage collection stall. The Village Engineer pointed out that the curb was more aligned with the property since the curb had been pulled back.

Chairman Kehoe stated that the Visual Environment Board had submitted some comments regarding the aisle width in the parking lot, additional windows in the north façade, and landscaping improvements.

Chairman Kehoe asked about the aisle width to which the Village Engineer stated that the Village Code requires 23 ft. Although 24 ft was better, the aisle width should be no less than 22 ft. The Planning Board agreed that an increase of one foot would not provide substantial additional area for new plantings. Mr. Luntz stated his concern that the more narrow aisle would create less available parking space.

Chairman Kehoe brought up the Visual Environment Board's recommendation for additional windows in the north façade where there is a large brick wall at ground level. The Village Engineer and Mr. Lam explained that since the lot was a 'zero lot line' lot, there was a possibility that a future building on the adjacent Nappy property could be built up against the proposed building and for this reason, windows on the brick wall are not permitted by the Village Code.

With regard to the Visual Environment Board's recommendations about trees and plantings, Chairman Kehoe reminded the applicant that he is to return to the Planning Board for approval of a landscape plan at which point the Planning Board will discuss street trees, and the number and types of proposed plantings.

Chairman Kehoe stated, for the record, that the applicant will be on the agenda for Wednesday, March 9, 2011 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, per discussion at the previous Planning Board meeting on January 25, 2011.

The Village Engineer presented some necessary revisions on the project:

- 1) Removal of the small section of guide rail and posts in the sidewalk,
- 2) Revision of the parking analysis table to indicate that the property is in a C-2 zone which requires 2 parking spaces per apartment,
- 3) Sheet note #2 should indicate "street light" and not "utility pole,"
- 4) Correct the striping lines to be white with blue for handicap instead of the yellow lines noted in sheet note #7,
- 5) Curb islands near the sidewalk should be made of cobblestone or natural stone,
- 6) Add label of "with one 2-bedroom apartment" for the garage,
- 7) The minimum recommended width for the sidewalk is 4 ft. instead of the 3 ft indicated for two sections of sidewalk
- 8) Sheet note# 25 should be expanded to indicate that "the solid waste and recycling containers must be acceptable to the Superintendent of Public Works,"
- 9) The applicant should submit a landscaping plan for the Planning Boards' approval with the species and size of all landscaping and existing landscaping labeled.

The Village Engineer raised the issue of street lighting fixtures and whether the Planning board wanted to see a particular type of fixture. Mr. Lam stated that he chose fixtures that fit in with what was in the neighborhood. Mr. Luntz stated that he was comfortable with the lighting that Mr. Lam chose.

Chairman Kehoe read the draft resolution and stated that the only condition in the resolution is for the applicant to go to the Zoning Board for a side yard variance.

The Village Engineer would send the architect and applicant a memorandum discussing additional notes.

A motion was made by Mr. Luntz to open the public hearing for this application and seconded by Mr. Kauderer. There were no public comments. A motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. Luntz and seconded by Mr. Kauderer, and carried by a vote of 3-0.

A motion to approve the resolution was made by Mr Kauderer and seconded by Mr. Luntz, and carried by a vote of 3-0.

3. NEW BUSINESS

Pat and Tara Zanfardino—101 Brook Street—Sec. Blk. Lot [formerly Sec. Blk. Lot])—Application for a preliminary subdivision approval and wetlands activity permit.

Mr. Greg McWilliams, architect, presented the application and explained there were two parts to this application: a subdivision of an existing single family parcel in which the overall lot size was approximately 14,000 sq. ft or about 1/3 of an acre. and a wetlands activity permit.

Mr. McWilliams explained that the subdivided lot would create a corner lot that is relatively high on the hill. He stated that the topography provides a nice setting for a house. There is a stone wall behind the house. The trees which border on the topography will not have be cut down. The biggest issue is that whole property is technically within a watercourse. Chairman Kehoe pointed out that this is the same water that is connected with the Croton Community Nursery School project.

Mr. McWilliams stated that the existing stone wall is quite disintegrated and at present there is no wall at certain portions.

Chairman Kehoe stated that because of the downstream of this property the water goes underground and under roads. Chairman Kehoe asked if the family that is living in the house (101 Brook St) has problems with water flooding the house. Mr. Zanfardino stated that only the garage gets some water in a severe storm.

Mr. McWilliams shared photographs of the streetscape, the garage, the house, the lot where the house will be built, the existing split rail fence, and the watercourse that goes under the garage.

The Village Engineer stated that redoing the wall would stop the erosion of the channel and some of the water that continues in the open channel. The historical development of Brook Street is that the buildings were built over a stream. There was a spillway built by Kaplan's Pond that helped create a detention basin to prevent some of the water flow.

Mr. McWilliams stated that the proposed house was above water level, no trees were being taken down, and the plans would provide for on-site retention for water overflow through three drywells, sized to hold 5 inches of rain. They also would dig a trench with PVC pipe and gravel which can help retention of water.

Chairman Kehoe stated that he did not think this house would exacerbate the water problem, and Mr. Luntz commented that the proposed house was not contributing to the water course.

Chairman Kehoe asked the Village Engineer if the Planning Board issued wetlands activity permits. The Village Engineer explained the watercourse buffer is not really a wetlands buffer but the Planning Board needed to make sure the watercourse was protected and that there would be erosion control during construction. The Planning Board can grant a wetlands activity permit but should consider referring the application to the Water Control Commission who will then make a recommendation to the Planning Board. The application, an Unlisted Action, must also be referred to the Waterfront Advisory Committee to evaluate its consistency with the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program. Chairman Kehoe stated that the proposed application also raised issues about wetlands and drainage that the WAC and WCC would want to examine. The Planning Board will not take any further action until the committees return their comments to the Planning Board. Chairman Kehoe also reminded the Planning Board members that the WAC reviews an application twice—first for a preliminary consistency review, and then for a final consistency recommendation.

A motion was made by Mr. Luntz to recommend that the Planning Board refer this application to the Waterfront Advisory Committee and the Water Control Commission, seconded by Mr. Kauderer, and carried by a vote of 3-0.

Mr. McWilliams described the proposed house construction regarding its size (the house will total 1727 sq. ft.), car park options, setback from the street, and how the proposed construction fits in with the existing neighborhood.

Approval of the minutes was deferred until the next meeting because Mr. Kauderer had not been at the previous meeting and therefore no quorum was available to vote on the minutes.

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronnie L. Rose
Planning Board Secretary

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Planning Board held a public hearing on an Amended Site Plan application on Tuesday, February 8, 2011 for Dino Tsagarakis—383 South Riverside Avenue, hereafter known as “the Applicant,” said property located in the C-2 Zoning District and South Riverside/Harmon Gateway Overlay Zone, at 383 South Riverside Ave. and designated on the Tax Map of the Village of Croton-on-Hudson as Section 78.13 Block 2 Lot 27; and

WHEREAS, this Amended Site Plan application is for renovations and addition to existing building, including improvements to exterior finishes and storefront, and site improvements; and

WHEREAS, this proposal is considered a Type II Action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA); therefore, no Negative Declaration is required.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Amended Site Plan application, as shown on Drawing #S001.00 entitled “Site Plan;” Drawing #S002.00 entitled “Site Lighting;” Drawing #S003.00 entitled “Site Details;” and Drawing #S004.00 entitled “Site Details,” Drawing #A201.00 entitled “First Floor Construction Plan”, Drawing #A202.00 entitled “Second Floor Construction Plan”, Drawing #A203.00 entitled “Roof Level Construction Plan”, Drawing #A801.00 entitled “Exterior Elevations”, and Drawing #A802.00 entitled “Exterior Elevations,” stamped received February 8, 2011 prepared by LAM Architectural Workshop, be approved subject to the following conditions:

- 1) A side yard variance being granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals for the first floor addition,
- 2) Applicant is to follow up on notes per memorandum from Village Engineer to the Planning Board dated February 9, 2011.

In the event that this Amended Site Plan is not implemented within three (3) years of this date, this approval shall expire.

The Planning Board of the Village of
Croton-on-Hudson, New York

Chris Kehoe, Chairman
Mark Aarons (absent)
Fran Allen (absent)
Bruce Kauderer
Robert Luntz

Motion to approve by Mr.Kauderer seconded by Mr. Luntz and carried by a vote of 3 to 0.

Resolution accepted with the minutes of the meeting held on _____.