

**ADOPTED MINUTES
VILLAGE OF ARDSLEY - PLANNING BOARD
MEETING of MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 2015**

I. Call to Order

The Session was called to order at 8:00 p.m.

Board Members in Attendance: Robert Pellegrino, Chair
 Art Hunter
 Jerome Parnes

The Chair stated that the agenda will be taken out of order.

**II. New York Foundling Hospital
Proposed relocation of new building
Informal discussion**

This a proposed site plan amendment for the replacement of a home for people with developmental disabilities which is licensed by the State of New York.

The original plan located the new home 120 feet from the existing home. That site was selected because it is fairly level, has a low water table. The location directly to the East was avoided because of steep slope, and the location to the West is a septic field. The Village of Ardsley worked with us to have existing home operating during construction of new home. Temporary utilities and a temporary curbcut were approved, and many more safety concerns were addressed due to construction so close to existing home.

The attorney for New York Foundling advised that the lowest of five bids on the construction was 50% more than the expenditure approved by the State. The State directed New York Foundling to come back to the Village to discuss a change in location that might allow construction within budget.

The Chair stated that everyone understood that if residents were temporarily relocated, there would be a cost to move them, and no one wants to disrupt the residents. However, from a planning point of view, the original site in front of the existing house is the best location for many reasons. The Village has made accommodations, and the State should respect our interest in planning. In addition, this property and this location offer possibilities for the future that other locations do not, such as if the State decides to spend the money for a second structure on the property.

The Chair pointed out that if the decision was made this evening, it would be to deny the reconsideration, and suggested that since two other members were not present, New York Foundling could come back again at the next meeting and try to persuade the others. Mr. Parnes also suggested that New York Foundling come back with more specific updated information about costs.

This matter was left open at 8:22 PM.

**III. Anthony Santavicca, 85 Heatherdell Road
Proposed regrading and curb cut widening
Site plan review**

The Chair noted that the typical curb cut is 14 feet, and that the existing driveway already appears to be the width of two driveways, or about 20 feet wide.

Mr. Santavicca's engineer, John Annunziata, spoke in favor of the proposal. He said that the existing driveway is like "going into a one-car garage," and that the owner has been parking on the dirt. Mr. Annunziata stated that although they can place two cars in the driveway, they can not open the driver's door when the cars are side by side. The proposed width is 31 feet, and Mr. Annunziata believes that the plan is within land coverage guidelines.

Mr. Hunter noted that the proposal includes an extension along the back part of the driveway. Mr. Parnes points out that it creates an issue of precedents of curb cuts. The Chair stated that it may be difficult for the Board to act without looking at it, and asked Mr. Annunziata to bring an accurate diagram of the existing driveway to the next meeting of the Planning Board.

This matter was left open at 8:26 PM.

**IV. Crossroad Building Corp. (by Irvington Builders, Inc.)
Sprain & Cross Roads / Ashford Avenue
Proposed preliminary subdivision plat, including storm water pollution prevention
plan, to develop 5.8 acre site ("Sprain Brook Manor at Ardsley")
Public Hearing and SEQRA Review**

The Chair read the legal notice on this matter.

Open Public Hearing

Mr. Paul Petretti, civil engineer & land surveyor, explained that the first step in this project is to create considerable hydraulic capacity by taking water under Ashford Avenue with drainage extensions, and to do a stream restoration of the area that had been

Lings's Aquarium in the 1970s. He explained that one area had been channelized so that it now makes a radical left and a radical left turn, whereas the original stream from Exeter and Cross Roads was gentle, and that moving the stream will make flooding much left frequent, and added that part of the plan is to make a constructed wetlands. Mr. Petretti noted that the county sewer runs through there to Jackson Avenue, and that United Water wants them to run pipe along Sprain Rd and then up and around.

The Chair noted that this plan, including proposed stream work and geometry of lots, was previously vetted by the Board. As a matter of law, things have not changed except that there now will be affordable housing on one of the lots, because in subdivisions of ten lots or more, some affordable housing must be provided.

The following members of the public in attendance asked questions about the proposal. They are:

Mr. Nick Briles of 19 Cross Road

Mr. Vincent Colangelo of 7 Cross Road

Ms. Shannon Lines of 649 Ashford Avenue

Ms. Susan Newman Loehr of 5 Cross Road

Mr. Gerald Loehr of 5 Cross Road

Public: Why the affordable housing wouldn't be put near the wetlands?

The Chair explained that there are many reasons for the location. One reason is to help the stream as much as possible, to have less of a problem at Cross Road and Ashford Avenue. The exact location of any dwelling or dwellings on the Ashford Ave lot would be the subject of a separate hearing. What you see now may not be location of any of the houses on lots. It is one of the better size lots, so better for 2 homes. Another benefit of being closer to Ashford Avenue is if someone needs to take a bus. The decision about what gets built on that lot will be the subject of a separate hearing, and if it is more than one house, it will not be before this Board.

Public: Suggest moving drainage area up and moving affordable income house closer to Ashford Avenue to have a shorter driveway.

Mr. Petretti explained that with a 27,800 square foot lot, there is some flexibility in the exact location of homes, and allows for more generous planting. Mr. Pat Cleary said that a future environmental determination of, for example, wetland replacement, would limit where the house could be located, and that while this would be the subject of a separate site plan hearing, it is less likely that the house would go at all Easterly due to drainage.

Public: Why would you put affordable housing in the middle of the lot?

The Chair explained that what will go where will be based on advice from planner, but noted that this will be a cul-de-sac and that the lots are likely to change.

Public: What is the time frame for development?

The Chair replied that though the stream restoration could happen sooner, no one would be building before spring 2016.

Public: Has anyone contacted FEMA, because he is concerned about an increase in premiums for flood insurance?

Mr. Cleary stated that such a short segment of stream would not be likely to cause an insurance adjustment of FEMA map, and Mr. Grecian added that if the str restoration lowered water levels in the area, you could go for an adjustment.

Public: Who do Messrs. Grecian and Cleary represent?

The Chair stated that both represent the Village as consultants to the Village, but that applicant bears the cost of their services through an escrow account.

Public: What does a wetland looks like?

Mr. Petretti described that it would be depressed 3 feet deep, have islands of trees within it, with bern between. He added that it would not be barren soil, that the plants on it would grow about 3 feet high, and that they likely would be flowering plants to attract birds.

Mr. Petretti advised the Board that the stream protection would take about three months, and that if this work does not begin now, it would have to wait until the spring.

The Chair advised that it is not because of the Board that the preliminary approval slipped, and that the Board should have the benefit of whatever the DEC would say prior to approving the proposed plat. The Chair therefore would authorize that notice be given, so that at the next meeting, the Board could have the State's guidance.

The public hearing was left open and adjourned at 9:20 PM.

V. Approval of Minutes

The Chair moved, and Jerome Parnes seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of June 8, 2015. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair moved, and Art Hunter seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of July 13, 2015. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair moved, and Art Hunter seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of May 11, 2015. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair moved, and Jerome Parnes seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of April 13, 2015. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair moved, and Jerome Parnes seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of July 11, 2014, with the corrections noted on pages 4 and 5. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair moved, and Jerome Parnes seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of June 9, 2014, with the two corrections noted on the last page. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair moved, and Art Hunter seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of February 10, 2015. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair moved, and Art Hunter seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of January 13, 2015. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair moved, and Art Hunter seconded, that the Board adopt the minutes of the meeting of December 9, 2014. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. Adjournment

There being no other business, the meeting of the Planning Board was adjourned at 9:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith B. Calder
Recording Secretary