

**Village of Croton-on-Hudson
Planning Board Meeting
Tuesday, April 9, 2013**

Present: Bruce Kauderer, Deputy Chairman
Mark Aarons
Steve Krisky

Absent: Rob Luntz, Chairman

Also Present: Daniel O'Connor, Village Engineer
Ann Gallelli, Trustee Liaison

1. Call to order at 8:06 p.m.

2. New Business

a) Mazen Safieh -- 11 Prospect Place (Sec. 67.20 Block 4 Lot 13)--Application for Minor Site Plan approval for new single family dwelling.

Tim Lener, Architect, and Vincent Massaro, P.E. presented on behalf of the applicant, Mazen Safieh who was also present. The engineer described the proposed single family dwelling and made the following points: the steep slopes disturbance is well under the threshold; there is no stormwater discharge; no variances are needed; the allowable building coverage is well below the limit and is in compliance with the zoning code; off-site improvements will be made which include a continuation of sidewalk, new concrete curbing, concrete driveway apron; there is existing lateral sewer and water service; and there is a utility pole near the neighbor's driveway so that the utility lines can run down the pole and be put underground to the house.

The engineer stated that there will be modular block walls for the two retaining walls. One wall is along the steps and the other wall in back is to keep the soil from degrading. Mr. Kauderer stated that he would like to know the colors of the retaining wall when it is decided. The two car garage is underneath the house.

Mr. Kauderer stated that it appeared that everything completed in the application was within compliance of the Village Code and asked the Village Engineer if this was the case. The Village Engineer confirmed that everything was in compliance--the steep slope disturbance is under the threshold; all zoning data is in compliance with code; changes were made to the plan to indicate that there is a cellar and not a basement (the cellar doesn't count as a story). The board will issue the tree removal permit. Mr. Kauderer commented that except for one tree, every tree looks dead. Mr. Massaro stated that the cedar tree on the side of the property will be saved.

Mr. Kauderer stated that a detailed letter had been submitted by a neighbor and Mr. Kauderer stated he would like the Planning Board to hear Mr. Massaro's response to the letter, point by point.

1. *Location of the house:* Mr. Massaro stated that the initial proposed location of the house was chosen to reduce impact to the site. Mr. Kauderer commented that the location also preserves the back of the house for a backyard. Mr. Lener stated that he had looked carefully at the views, and thought the views were best where he currently put the house.

2. *The views and windows:* Mr. Lener stated he had placed the rooms where he thought were best for his client and had included decent sized windows in the house .

3. *Location of driveway in case of ice:* Mr. Massaro stated that they were putting 4" belgian block by the driveway. When asked about the location of the driveway (on the lower grade of the property) Mr. Massaro explained that he had put the driveway there because it would reduce the amount of excavation. Mr. Kauderer asked about how they planned to excavate, and Mr. Massaro stated that they understood there was no blasting.

4. *Visual impact of the house:* Although there was some confusion about this comment, the applicant's engineer discussed some of the elevation calculations.

5. *Storm and footing drain locations:* The Village Engineer stated that this was discussed and an underdrain can be connected to an existing drain. A condition in the resolution will be included that the drain is underground and will be connected to the the existing storm drain pipe underground. This will also prevent icing on the sidewalk.

6. *Utilities:* Mr. Kauderer stated that a condition of the resolution will be that all utilities should be underground. Regarding the central HVAC system, the Village Engineer stated that the compressor should be in the middle of the property to which the architect stated this was not a problem.

7. *Existing trees:* The Planning Board recommended that the plan be revised to show what trees are going to be removed. The Planning Board members stated that they would like to see a landscaping plan including necessary screening, location and type of species, and grass areas to be seeded.

8. *Exterior wall construction:* Mr. Lener stated that 2 x 4 studs are allowed by code and one can get equal amount of insulation as with 2 x 6 studs. In response to the neighbor's comments about excavation, Mr. Lener stated that there will be no blasting and he will have proper barriers to protect the adjacent landscaped bank on the neighbors' property. The Village Engineer stated that requirements for excavation and fill will be in the resolution.

9. *Stone walls:* Mr. Lener stated that instead of concrete block he will add stone veneer and a stone veneer foundation wall so it is more aesthetically pleasing to the neighbor.

10. *Character and Context:* Mr. Lener stated that there will be wood shingle siding, scalloped shingles, mahogany for decking, timberline roof, Anderson windows, and cottage style grills. He believes this is all in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Krisky asked if a color rendering was possible and Mr. Lener agreed to provide one at the next meeting.

Mr. Kauderer stated that the Planning Board would like to hear what the neighbor had to say since he had written a letter to the Planning Board.

Mr. James Rhodes, of 111 N. Riverside Avenue, stated he has served on the Advisory Board for the Visual Environment (VEB) and he had concerns about the visual impact of the proposed house. From his point of view, it is a 44 ft. roofline over a visual baseline and a person would see a 44 ft high structure driving up Prospect Place. Mr. Flynn's house (15 Prospect) is significantly back from street.

There was a discussion about the grade line. Mr. Krisky commented that because the Village allows an extra floor (the cellar) the height is raised. Mr. Kauderer stated he did not think the house looked like a three story house. Mr. Rhodes stated that the grade line could be raised and believed the grade was manipulated in the site plan. Mr. Krisky asked Mr. Rhodes if he was concerned that he would lose a visual view. Mr. Rhodes stated that his concern was broader than just his view--someone driving up Prospect Place would have this large visual impact of the house.

The Planning Board discussed the location of the house on the property. Mr. Kauderer pointed out that moving the house back would create more disturbance and he also understood why the applicant would want a back yard. Mr. Aarons stated that if they moved the house back three or four feet, the house might not look like a protrusion. Mr. Krisky agreed. The Village Engineer confirmed that this lot was approved in 1979 as a compliant single family lot in a two family RB zoning district.

Mr. Rhodes also brought up the concern about icy conditions on Prospect Place which could cause a car, turning into the driveway, to slide into the neighboring property. He did not believe a four inch Belgian Block curb would stop a sliding car on ice. The Planning Board discussed possible solutions to the potential hazards of an icy road and driveway.

The Planning Board stated the following requirements for the next meeting:

1. The site plan should show that the house has been moved back a few feet from the front in order to keep in character with the neighborhood;
2. The applicant should get a survey of the neighbor's property;
3. A solution to be offered to the "potential icy conditions problem" in the driveway
4. The plan should indicate that the utilities are underground
5. A landscape plan needs to be completed by a landscape architect indicating which trees are to be removed, plantings, and seeded grass areas;
6. A colorized rendering should be provided.

The applicant, architect, and engineer will come to the next meeting on April 23, 2013.

b) Thomas Donofrio--37 Park Trail (Sec. 68.13 Block 3 Lot 8)--Application for Minor Site Plan approval and Wetlands Permit for new single family dwelling.

Julie Evans, Architect, presented the application for a new cottage to be built on the site of a now demolished cottage. Originally the owners wanted to create a new house on an old foundation but upon inspection of the existing foundation, it was determined the project would be much improved by starting with a new foundation and rebuilding the garage on the footprint of the existing garage. Mr. Kauderer commented that this is basically a new house, and Mr. Aarons stated that the envelope was the same.

Ms. Evans presented a model of the future house, and she described the location as charming and the neighborhood as eclectic and fun. There will a tree removed which is next to the driveway and too close to the house; the driveway will be replaced with gravel and the house will be a little bit larger in the back but the footprint is primarily staying the same. The house will be a 2300 square ft. house with very little disturbance. There will be no blasting.

The Village Engineer stated that the Planning Board must refer this application to the Water Control Commission because of the need for a Wetland Permit (for the disturbance of a stream channel buffer).

Planning Board Meeting
April 9, 2013

Mr. Kauderer stated that after the Planning Board refers this application to the WCC, and the Planning Board receives their recommendations, a public hearing will be held at the next Planning Board meeting on April 23, 2013.

Mr. Aarons moved that application be referred to WCC for recommendation on Wetland permit; Mr. Krisky seconded the motion, carried by a vote of 3-0, all in favor. Mr. Krisky called for a public hearing, seconded by Mr. Aarons, carried by a vote of 3-0, all in favor.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of February 12, 2013 were approved on a motion by Mr. Aarons, seconded by Mr. Krisky, and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

The minutes of March 12, 2013 were approved on a motion by Mr. Krisky, seconded by Mr. Aarons, and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ronnie L. Rose
Planning Board Secretary