

VILLAGE OF ARDSLEY
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

October 11, 2011

This Session was called to order at 8:03 P.M.

Board Members in Attendance: Robert Pellegrino
 Jerry Parnes
 Bernhard Preisser

Absent: Paul Paino
 Robert Paley

1. Project – Continuation of Public Hearing – Landscape Plan
 25 Park Avenue

This application was adjourned until next month because there was no quorum present.

VILLAGE OF ARDSLEY
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

October 11, 2011

This Session was called to order at 8:05 P.M.

Board Members in Attendance: Robert Pellegrino, Chairman
 Jerry Parnes
 Bernhard Preisser

Absent: Paul Paino
 Robert Paley

2. Project - New Apartment Building – Parasol Corp.
 Saw Mill River Road

Present - Mr. Emilio Escaladas – Architect
 Mr. Hugh Greechan – Woodard & Curran
 Mr. Larry Tomasso – Building Inspector

Mr. Pellegrino opened this session by asking Mr. Escaladas if he had reviewed Woodard & Curran's memo letter. Mr. Escaladas replied that he had done so and discussed each of the items with Hugh Greechan. Mr. Pellegrino then recapped the items:

1. Provide detail note on the stone dissipaters;
2. Provide calculations for drywells.
3. Change details on location of perforated pipe.
4. Provide additional detail on retaining wall.

Mr. Pellegrino then asked about the status of the DOT permit and both Mr. Escaladas and Mr. Greechan confirmed that it had been issued; lastly, Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Tomasso and the other Board members if they had any other concerns or comments. All were satisfied.

Mr. Pellegrino made a motion for the Planning Board to recommend to the Board of Trustees the approval of site plan, latest revision dated 10/11/01, subject to the Applicant's satisfaction of the conditions set forth in the Woodard and Curran memo letter dated 10/10/11, and delivery to Woodard and Curran and the Building Inspector of the conformed set of plans. Mr. Parnes seconded the motion and all members agreed.

This session was adjourned at 8:07 P.M.

VILLAGE OF ARDSLEY
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

October 11, 2011

This Session was called to order at 8:10 P.M.

Board Members in Attendance: Robert Pellegrino, Chairman
Jerry Parnes
Bernhard Preisser

Absent: Paul Paino
Robert Paley

3. Project - Review and Comment
Elm Street Sports Group

Present - Mr. Paul Petretti – Engineer Mr. Larry Tomasso
Patricia Hoffman – Attorney
Stephanie Scherer
Joan and Warren Scherer

Mr. Pellegrino opened this session by asking Mr. Petretti if he had a chance to look at Woodard & Curren's memo letter of 10/10/11. Mr. Petretti answered that he had already responded to some of the comments by email earlier in the day and was in agreement with the items mentioned. Mr. Pellegrino then recapped the items.

1. Provide proof of required NYS DEC Permit, or its inapplicability
2. Provide SWPPP
3. Correct Plan to show no regrading on the Dobbs Ferry portion of the property

Mr. Petretti went on to say, regarding the stormwater requirements, that the project may not be under DEC jurisdiction because the Applicant's plan involves only minor disturbance. This will be confirmed.

Mr. Pellegrino asked what was planned for the building itself in terms of flood proofing, and Mr. Petretti replied they would attempt to flood proof the first floor of the enclosed portion of the Building to a degree sufficient to withstand an event in excess of a 100 year event.

In regard to the SWPPP, Mr. Petretti that the required measures will be taken and show on the plan, and also that the Applicant has cleaned out the basins on Elm Street and is willing to continue to do so during construction, as the biggest issue is silt.

Mr. Pellegrino asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Pellegrino then went on to discuss what he and Mr. Preisser felt was a potentially dangerous circumstance for drivers exiting Elm Street, particularly when traffic would be expected to back up (because of a session letting out) impatient drivers, having waited in line, might jump out into 9A without more careful consideration of the on-coming southbound after-Ashford light line of cars which are known to pick up speed. In response to the point that vehicles have been exiting Elm for many years and no serious accidents have occurred, it was pointed out that the majority of them were buses and trucks readily seen by the southbound travelers and while there are the bus drivers who come and leave with their personal cars, they do not do so at the very worst traffic times and, above all, are experienced

and well acquainted with the intersection. Those using the facility can be expected to include younger drivers and parents, many with full cars/vans.

Mr. Petretti replied that the site distances are technically more than adequate, that Adler Consulting had no problem with the traffic plan, and that there shouldn't be an issue with careful driving, but he was open to sit down and discuss the concern again with Mr. Cleary and Mr. Greechan. One of the Planning Board's suggestions discussed was heavy striping and perhaps some additional signage at the point of exit.

Mr. Preisser then turned to the circulation around the building and noted that it was counterclockwise and so counterintuitive. Ms. Stephanie Scherer presented plans showing details of the traffic flow, including that the counterclockwise pattern avoids crossing lanes, but agreed that an additional sign or two would help and will be incorporated.

Mr. Pellegrino asked if Mr. Greechan, Mr. Tomasso, or any of the other Board members had any further comments. There were none.

Mr. Pellegrino made a motion for the Planning Board to recommend to the Board of Trustees the approval of site plan, latest revision dated 10/11/01, subject to the Applicant's satisfaction of the conditions set forth in the Woodard and Curran memo letter dated 10/10/11 and the Cleary memo letter dated the same date, but subject also to the Planning Board's concerns as expressed in the minutes about traffic safety at the exit/entrance to Elm, particularly those leaving the project and turning northbound. Mr. Petretti and Mr. Greechan stated that they would discuss the matter further with Mr. Cleary and offer some suggestions. Mr. Parnes seconded and all members agreed.

This project was adjourned at 8:35 P.M.

VILLAGE OF ARDSLEY
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

October 11, 2011

This Session was called to order at 8:37 P.M.

Board Members in Attendance: Robert Pellegrino, Chairman
Jerry Parnes
Bernhard Preisser

Absent: Paul Paino
Robert Paley

4. Project - Review and Comment
Waterwheel Project

Present - Conrad Roncati - Architect
Eric Zamft – Saccardi and Schiff
Hugh Greechan – Woodard and Curran
Deborah Post – Community Housing Innovations
Alexander Roberts – Community Housing Innovations
Larry Tomasso

Mr. Pellegrino opened this session by summarizing the project and noting that the Planning Board, which has reviewed earlier versions of the plan, continues to act in an advisory capacity to the BOT. He asked if Mr. Roncati had a chance to review the memo from Woodard and Curran, the consulting engineer; Mr. Roncati replied in the affirmative. Mr. Pellegrino stated that when he last appeared before the Board, Mr. Roncati was told that there were three items of major concern to the Planning Board; namely, the conveyance of storm water across the property, including not only the sizing of the pipes on the property but the sizing of the pipes under 9A and their ability to adequately receive and convey that stormwater; the landscaping plan at the southwest corner of the property which the Planning Board felt should include more screening and tiered plant variety (not just a few blue spruce); and the location of the detention devices to be used at that southwest corner which the Planning Board preferred be located, in whole or in part, in another area (because of the potential impact of the detention devices on the ability to properly and fully landscape the corner. He then asked Mr. Roncati to respond.

Regarding the water, Mr. Roncati stated that the design begins with a concrete catchment area with wings and riprap on the easterly slope, all of which, along with steel strainers and trash racks, the consulting engineer has approved; and that the piping across the property had been resized from 30” to 36”, at the suggestion of the engineer. Mr. Pellegrino then asked about the size of the piping under 9A that would receive the conveyed stormwater, and Mr. Roncati stated that they were 24” and 36”. Discussion ensued about the possible adverse consequences of the difference in pipes sizes and Mr. Roncati and Mr. Greechen stated that there is no doubt in his mind about the reasonable adequacy of the size of the pipes on the property, and that the issue of the piping under the road and the catchment between the property and road are all before the DOT engineer who will make the decision as to whether the State is satisfied with the overall

design. Mr. Pellegrino summed up the drainage issue by asking if it was the applicant's position that if the State found the existing 9A piping and catchment acceptable, there would be no consequence to the Village because the stormwater would just flow across the road if the piping could not handle the flow. Mr. Roncati said it was, and Mr. Greechan affirmed the position.

Mr. Preisser asked about whether there would be increased water into Macy Park. Mr. Greechan replied that the water is being conveyed but not increased and that the detention system might actually slow some of the water

Mr. Pellegrino then asked about the landscape plan and detention at the southwest corner. Mr. Pellegrino stated that Mr. Roncati had last stated he would figure out the detention needed which he had done, and that it is smaller than was originally thought. He said he expected that the detention at that size could be reconfigured to allow more planting on their landscape plan. Mr. Pellegrino asked why Mr. Roncati hadn't examined the possibility of locating the detention under the paved areas as was suggested by Mr. Greechan at the last plan review, and Mr. Roncati said he thought that the smaller detention and reconfiguration would make that unnecessary. Mr. Pellegrino expressed concern that that might not be the case, and that the corner in question presents the best opportunity to screen the largest view of the project – the view to be seen by those traveling northbound, and also to create a feature that would do more than create screening but be especially attractive, with tiered appropriate plantings on the slope. He said the PB should be made confident that the detention will not pose an issue.

Mr. Pellegrino suggested that the applicant present a scaled perspective drawing, in color, drawn from the viewpoint of those who would be approaching from the south, as well as a more developed landscape plan. Mr. Pellegrino polled the Board members for their thoughts. There was more discussion regarding design and planting ideas.

Mr. Pellegrino made a motion recommending that there be confirmation that the State and County have no objections to the stormwater design, and that the perspective drawing and a much more developed landscape design plan be submitted for review; other than as relates to those matters the Planning Board had no further comments or objections. Mr. Parnes seconded and all members were in agreement.

This session was adjourned at 9:10 P.M.

VILLAGE OF ARDSLEY
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

October 11, 2011

Board Members in Attendance: Robert Pellegrino, Chairman
Jerry Parnes
Bernhard Preisser

Absent: Paul Paino
Robert Paley

5. Project – Continuation of Public Hearing
Subdivision, Steep Slope/Wetlands
Cross Road/Ashford Ave./Sprain Road/
Ardsley Road

This application was adjourned until next month.

The next Planning Board meeting will be held on Monday, November 14, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Lois Duggan
Acting Planning Board Secretary
October 12, 2011