TOWN OF GREENBURGH PLANNING BOARD

-----x

- 1. ROLL CALL
- 5. ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING/PUBLIC DISCUSSION
 - a) Case No. PB 20-11, Gowran 1048 Dobbs Ferry Road (P.O. White Plains, N.Y.)
 - b) Case No. PB 19-25, Gez 25 High Point Lane (P.O. Scarsdale, N.Y.)
 - c) Case No. PB 20-08
 Greystone-on-Hudson PUD
 Carriage Trail (P.O.Tarrytown, N.Y.)
- 7. ADJOURNMENT

-----x

Greenburgh Town Hall 177 Hillside Avenue Greenburgh, New York 10607 September 2, 2020

Meeting conducted via Zoom Video Conference

1	
2	APPEARANCES:
3	
4	WALTER SIMON, CHAIRMAN
5	HUGH SCHWARTZ, VICE CHAIRMAN
6	JOHAN SNAGGS, Board Member
7	KIRIT DESAI, Board Member MONA FRAITAG, Board Member
8	MICHAEL GOLDEN, Board Member THOMAS HAY, Board Member
9	
10 11	ALSO PRESENT: AARON SCHMIDT, Deputy Commissioner of The Department of
12	Community Development and Conservation
13	DAVID R. FRIED, ESQ. First Deputy Town Attorney
14	MATTHEW BRITTON,
15	Assistant Planner to the Department of Community Development and Conservation
16	
17	
18	BARBARA MARCIANTE, Official Senior Court Reporter
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: At this point, we can go into the Public Hearing on two cases, the Gowran and the Gez.

There was the Greystone-on-Hudson that was on the agenda. The agreement with the Planning Board was that we would not allow them to come back until everything was in place. The Town of Tarrytown required them to do an inspection of items that led up to the Greystone facility. They did the inspection.

They got approval from the engineers and everything was in place. And at that point they asked to put it back on the agenda, which I did.

And at the last minute, the Town wanted them to do the same on another set of pipes. They agreed to do that, but now that's why I'm taking it off the agenda.

Because up until the last minute, everything was in place.

They did everything that Tarrytown asked them to do. And they got all the approval from the engineers, but that's what happened. So that's why it got on the agenda and that's why it's coming off. And any questions?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Chairperson Simon, ultimately after we do the roll call and start the Public Hearings, we will ask that the Board take a vote to adjourn. So I just wanted to note that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Yes. And then the other case why we got on the Public Hearing was Gowran. And Aaron,

sent some background information why, in this case, unlike other cases, we would not do a Public Hearing until we first got Zoning approval.

This is an uncoordinated review and so that Order, you know, that Order doesn't really apply, but nevertheless, we have the option, they still, regardless of what the outcome of it, that we can have the hearing, but we do not make a decision until we hear back from the Zoning Board.

So that is a procedure that is an approval procedure in cases like this, in a limited case like this. If David or Aaron would like to chime in with additional legal reasons why this practice is acceptable, please do.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I have a legal question to David procedurally. If that's the case, we can't close this hearing --

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Exactly.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: -- until we hear back from the Zoning Board.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Exactly.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: We can't even close it or else the 20 days or whatever that time limit starts, the clock starts ticking if we close the Hearing.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Well, I think there would be sufficient time. But there is no -- and you

can close it. You just cannot -- it just doesn't make sense to issue an Order by that point.

But given that the ZBA meeting is after, I believe it's after our next meeting, we can hold over the Hearing another, you know, for, I was going to say for another two weeks, it is two weeks, yeah. I'm trying to remember my calendar. And have a continued Public Hearing at the next meeting, if anyone else has any issues or something.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: But technically,

David, I thought the clock starts -- if once we close the

Public Hearing, we're required to make a decision within a

prescribed period of time.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: From the of close the record. So you can hold the record open for a period of time. It's, you know, it's apples -- I shouldn't say apples, it's one choice or the other. You can do that, you can hold it over --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I just wanted to make sure.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: That's a good point. And I think, and I'm sorry, it's off the top of my head, I think it's 60 days.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Yes, 60 days, okay.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay, but the key point is that we cannot make a decision until we hear back from the Zoning Board.

And the question is, we don't want our hands to be forced if, for whatever reason, the Zoning Board does not make a decision on that, we have to make sure we have an out, that we are not forced to make a decision without the Zoning Board opining on this. So I think Hugh's point is correct. So with that said, let's start with the first application.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Mr. Desai has a question.

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Yes. My question is twofold. Is the applicant has a request expedite the review or conduct the review from Planning Board and Zoning Board? Or we just are wanted to be do it so that we can have our, doing it quickly, as quickly as possible.

Because I think I agree with Hugh's comments that if we have it like next two, three meeting completely backed up, then we can do it, but otherwise why do we have to really rush it, I mean --

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Well, let me, it's not a case of rushing. It's a case that it came up as an

applicant who wished to get a pass with a zoning and normally, our normal procedure is, that you go through Zoning Board and then you come back to us. There is no legal requirement that we take that route. So the question is why not do it. It's not a case of rushing.

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: You are right. Why to do it. I mean, and I think Hugh's point is that the last meeting weeks are stacked up so much and then we have to kind of extend the time.

So yes, I would do it if the applicant requested it or if there is any other kind of scheduling issue with the future meeting that we cannot wait for Zoning Board to get their approval. I mean, maybe I --

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay, I hear you, but the question becomes it's not the matter of -- We follow procedures and the standard procedure is that we don't act until the Zoning Board acts. That's the standard procedure.

In this case, the standard procedure does not govern. We could use a standard procedure in this type of case only. The standard procedure in this type of case, we could go through a Public Hearing, don't make a decision and wait.

So it's not a question of rushing or not rushing. It's just the case of what makes sense and that was the

basis of which I put it on the agenda. So I hear what you're saying, but it's on the Public Hearing tonight. So let's move forward with the Public Hearing, okay.

And then at the end, we can decide what will be the best way of going forward, whether or not we close the Public Hearing or whether or not we do not close it or adjourn the Public Hearing. Okay, so we can make that decision, take a vote --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Mr. Chairman? I just have another question about the Public Hearing.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Yes. Sure.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Our Public Hearing, as I understand, is only on the watercourse, wetlands watercourse permit, correct?

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Right, that's right.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Right. So I was going to announce that when we get into the project after we do roll call, which I would suggest we do at this point and make sure that Barbara is ready to start transcribing for us.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: My point is that the testimony we should hear tonight should be related to the wetland watercourse. Anything else, site line and things like that are really a subject for the Zoning Board.

1	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Right.
2	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: I agree.
3	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: So with that said, do we have
4	a representative?
5	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: I think we have to take
6	roll call.
7	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Why don't I take
8	the roll call.
9	(Whereupon, a short discussion was held between
10	the Board and the Court Reporter.)
11	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Now, David, just for
12	the record, because in terms of taking the roll call, we
13	did it at the beginning and so we should do it again at the
14	hearing?
15	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Yes, we
16	decided that
17	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Be consistent.
18	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: at a couple
19	meetings back we will do it at the beginning of the meeting
20	and when we start Public Hearing.
21	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay, fine. Let's take the
22	roll call again.
23	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Very good.
24	Chairperson Walter Simon?
25	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Here.

1	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Vice Chairperson
2	Hugh Schwartz?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Here.
4	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Michael Golden?
5	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Here.
6	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Kirit Desai?
7	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Here.
8	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mona Fraitag?
9	BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Here.
10	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Thomas Hay?
11	BOARD MEMBER HAY: Here.
12	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Just note for the
13	record that Mr. Johan Snaggs is running a bit behind. He
14	should with us shortly. Thank you.
15	So the first case, as mentioned by Chairperson
16	Simon, is Case Number PB 20-11, the Gowran project at 1048
17	Dobbs Ferry Road, P.O. White Plains, New York. The case
18	before this Planning Board this evening is a Planning Board
19	wetland watercourse permit that's been requested by the
20	applicant.
21	We have Mr. Gowran as well as his design
22	professional, Mr. Michael McGarvey, here to present the
23	project. And I am going to share the screen to put the
24	plans on the overhead or on the video so that everyone can
25	see them.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: I just have 1 2 one request of the applicant, is that Mr. McGarvey, if you speak, you identify yourself. If Mr. Gowran speaks, you 3 identify yourself. Because in this format, it's very hard 4 5 for the court reporter in this situation to see who is who. 6 MR. MICHAEL McGARVEY: We will. I'm going to try to do most of the talking. So -- just lost digital. There 7 I'm going to do most of the talking. 8 you go. If I need

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: You already violated the rule, you didn't identify yourself.

to me and I will reply to you.

anything from Mr. Gowran, I'll ask him and he will respond

MR. MICHAEL McGARVEY: Okay, for the record, my name is Michael McGarvey. I'm a New York State licensed professional engineer. I'm here tonight representing Mr. and Mrs. Gowran for the application of 1048 Dobbs Ferry Road, a new garage in the rear right-hand side of the property line.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Thank you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. McGarvey, can you walk us through the project? And then we will see if any Board Members have any follow-up questions. And then I believe there may be a member or more of the public that may wish to speak.

MR. MICHAEL McGARVEY: Absolutely. Again, this

is Michael McGarvey, design professional. As you can see on the overhead, we have the green area is the proposed garage. The blue line is the re-located stream or watercourse that runs through the property.

Now, I don't want you to think of this as a stream or a watercourse. It's just a drainage ditch. It only runs after or during a rainstorm or after the rainstorm once all the water sheds from the roadway itself. There is no continuous feed for this brook or anything else. Once it stops raining, the brook dries up.

But anyhow, as I was saying, if you look at the garage -- I'm sorry, if you look at the site plan, you can see where the old -- or there is a ditch that actually runs from right where the blue line comes into the property, that's right, goes right through the caddy corner to the property and enters in the back of the property right by the garage on the property behind us.

That, unfortunately, is located right where we need to put this garage. We will be coming down the driveway, turn into the garage.

Now, the zoning, we also require height variance, but that's not you guys. We will require a height variance with the Zoning Board and we have applied to them and we will meet with them shortly. We did the runoff for the whole area, an 18-inch drainpipe was more than enough.

We said okay, you know what, I'm just going to be put in a 24-inch drainpipe just to be sure, just to cover ourselves, and make sure nothing backs up onto the property or onto the State right of way. Everything comes from Dobbs Ferry Road, which obviously is a State owned road.

I do have four Cultec in the proposed, in the existing driveway to handle the stormwater runoff from the new impervious surface. What else. We did speak with the --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: I just want to interrupt for one second. I'm sorry, Mr. McGarvey. I just want to announce that Mr. Johan Snaggs, our other Planning Board Member, has now joined in on this session. So I just wanted to note that. Thank you. Continue, please. Sorry for the interruption.

BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Thank you, Aaron.

MR. MICHAEL McGARVEY: We have received six letters from the neighbors in support of this application. You should have at least five of them. One of them came in today. Is that correct, Aaron?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes, and I did circulate it to the Board Members.

MR. MICHAEL McGARVEY: Okay. So you should have six letters from the neighbors in support of this application. In fact, one of them, the one you received

today, originally was not in support, but I believe
Mr. Gowran went down and spoke with them and now he is in support.

Maybe he didn't understand what was going on. I don't know. But he's the guy who just sent in that letter today.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Okay. I just wanted to make a couple of points, if I may.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Go ahead.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Just, you know, we had seen this in work session before. We did have two members of the Planning Board go out to the site,

Ms. Fraitag and Mr. Snaggs. I know at that time the owner of the property had indicated that one tree, which had been proposed for removal, is instead going to be relocated with another tree to the other side of the property.

In addition to the four trees, which they still propose to plant, which are going to kind of screen some of the garage from Dobbs Ferry Road and then they have some plantings going around the side of the garage.

They also indicated to the Conservation Advisory Council, which issued a positive recommendation, that they were in the process of essentially of installing a number of Evergreens around the property as well. And there is a large solid fence along this rear property line that

1 separates the property to the rear.

As Mr. McGarvey indicated, the new stormwater runoff from the garage is proposed to be placed into a Cultec stormwater management system, which will be situated underneath the existing driveway area. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. As a general rule, what I would like to do, when we have a Board Member who visited the site, I would like the comments from Board Members to start with the Board Member who actually saw the site.

So I would like to start off with either Mona or Johan as to any comments that they have about this application seeing how they were there.

BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: I'll start, Walter. We both went to the site, Johan and I, and I think we were both very pleased with the plan that Mr. Gowran had for this project. It was very well thought out. And we believe that it will be a successful plan once he completes it.

It seemed to have -- he had spoken with the neighbors when we were there. We asked him if he had been in touch with them and he said he had, which we were pleased to hear. And we think it will be a good addition.

It's going to be screened from the roadway. We were pleased all and all with what was going on and that he

was taking care of the runoff. It was very dry. It's a dry bed. It's a dry bed, it only seems to fill up when there is a big storm from what Aaron was telling us.

There doesn't seem to be any running water. It was completely dry when we were there, as I recall. Does it ever get filled up, Aaron?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: So it does convey water, but I'm going to let the applicant's engineer speak to that.

I did want to make one note for the record just to clarify. So while the channel does keep water off of Dobbs Ferry Road, there is a small channel on the opposite side of Dobbs Ferry Road that runs through a few of the rear yard properties up there, but it does appear to just convey stormwater.

BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: During and shortly after rain events.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Johan, did you have any additional comments?

BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: I would just second everything Mona just said. It's a well thought-out plan. The mitigation probably wouldn't even be necessary, but the Cultec that he's going to put under the driveway to deal with any of the runoff is well thought out.

1	The plan looks to be consistent with the esthetic
2	of the neighborhood. The way he is going to hide it with
3	the trees and the trees that he plans on planting on the
4	other side of the yard as well.
5	I don't see it as being an intrusion at all for
6	the neighbors. And I'm glad that they signed off on it.
7	So it seems to be I'm in favor of it because it's in
8	compliance and it stays consistent with the esthetic of the
9	neighborhood.
10	BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Yeah, I think we both left
11	with a good feeling about it.
12	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Are there any other
13	Boards Members who would like to comment on this plan?
14	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
15	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: If not, is there anyone of
16	the public who would like to comment on this plan? No?
17	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: I know, Mr. Bodin,
18	did you have any did you want to speak to this project
19	or were you just interested in the other one?
20	MR. MURRAY BODIN: You said I couldn't speak on
21	this one. I'll speak just on the other side at the
22	appropriate time.
23	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: You can speak on it.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: In your email, you

had not indicated you had interest in this project. So on

24

25

1 the three that you had expressed, three or four you 2 expressed interest, the only one that was going to be on for Public Hearing was the 25 High Point Road, High Point 3 4 Lane project. Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. 6 MR. MURRAY BODIN: I have no comments at this 7 time. 8 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. And Mr. Bodin, I just 9 want to make it clear, because you did not indicate that you wanted to speak on a specific application, once you 10 11 join the Planning Board meeting, when it comes to public 12 comment, you can comment on any application, okay. 13 So you don't have to pre-register to specifically 14 speak on an application. I just want to make that clear, 15 okay. MR. MURRAY BODIN: Thank you very much. 16 17 having trouble understanding the rules of the various 18 meetings I go to because they are not consistent. 19 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Well, now, that I would 20 differ that we don't have consistent rules. But we won't 21 get into a debate on that. 22 MR. MURRAY BODIN: Well, your rules are 23 The other ones aren't the same. consistent.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Walter, with all due respect, our rules are different than the Town Board. Town

24

25

1 Board needs to speak to a specific project, that's true. 2 True, Murray, yes. They do have a different set of rules than we do. 3 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. So we don't -- okay. 4 MR. MURRAY BODIN: I'm very happy with the 5 6 information I get from Chairman Simon. It's been very accurate. And one of the reasons I come to these meetings 7 8 is to learn how to do things right. 9 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Now, with that said, 10 the question before us, we have two options. One is to 11 adjourn the Public Hearing to a date after the Zoning 12 Board, date uncertain, but after the Zoning Board made a decision. 13 14 We can close the Hearing, keep the record open 15 and not make a decision until the Zoning Board make a 16 decision. We can do it either way. My only concern is 17 that regardless which way we go, we're not caused to make a 18 decision prior to the Zoning Board making a decision. 19 So whichever one guarantees that, it doesn't 20 matter to me. That's my concern. That we're not forced to 21 make a decision before the Zoning Board. 22 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: I have a 23 suggestion --24 CHAIRPERSON SIMON:

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: -- if the Board

25

wants to consider it. I also want to note that before you do close the Hearing, that you consider classifying this as a Type II Action under SEQRA, which would effectively close out the SEQRA process with respect to this project before the Planning Board.

My suggestion in terms of procedure, if the Board was inclined to close the Public Hearing, you could leave the written record open until October 7th, which would be your next Board meeting after the ZBA meeting.

And if we reported back to the Planning Board that evening that the Zoning Board had not made a decision, and, David, please correct me if I'm wrong, the Planning Board could, at that time, vote to extend the written record period, if it wished to.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. So that's fine with me. I just want to make sure we're not stuck in a point, like I said, that may force us to make a decision before the Zoning Board. So let's do the first thing. I make a SEQRA determination that this is a --

BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Type II.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Pardon me? You said this is a Type I?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Type II.

1	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Type II.
2	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Of course not Type I. It has
3	to be a Type II.
4	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: So moved.
5	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Second.
6	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Moved by Michael. Second by?
7	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Kirit.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Kirit.
9	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Desai.
10	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: All in favor? Aye.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Aye.
12	BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Aye.
13	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Aye.
14	BOARD MEMBER HAY: Aye.
15	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Aye.
16	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Aye.
17	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: I move we close the Public
18	Hearing and leave the record open until, what date was
19	that, Aaron?
20	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: October 7th.
21	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: October 2nd.
22	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: 7th.
23	BOARD MEMBER HAY: 7th.
24	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: October 7th.
25	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: That's my motion.

1		CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Do we have a second?
2		BOARD MEMBER HAY: Second.
3		CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Second by Tom. All in favor?
4	Aye.	
5		BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Aye.
6		VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Aye.
7		BOARD MEMBER HAY: Aye.
8		BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Aye.
9		BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Aye.
10		BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Aye.
11		CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Oppose? Abstain?
12		(Whereupon, there was no response.)
13		CHAIRPERSON SIMON: So moved.
14		MR. MICHAEL McGARVEY: Thank you all.
15		CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Now a motion to close
16		FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: No.
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Now, the other one on is PB 19-25, Gez at 25 High Point Lane, preliminary subdivision.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Yes, we are here.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: So that's a preliminary subdivision and the tree removal permit application request. We have Mr. Emilio Escaladas here on behalf of the owner. He is the engineer and surveyor on the project. He can walk us through it. I do have the availability of sharing the drawings.

I wanted to just note quickly that following the last work session or coming out of the last work session, there was a request by the Planning Board for the applicant to put forth two alternate design plans for the cul-de-sac, the conventional cul-de-sac layout that was initially proposed.

The applicant's engineer has done that. It was submitted to the Board. I have those plans, if we need to put them on the screen for everyone, but Mr. Escaladas will walk us through those.

He did submit a narrative that accompanied those drawings. So I will let him speak to those. But first, if you would, Mr. Escaladas, if you would, for the benefit of the members of the public that are watching either live or at home to walk us through the proposal in some detail, okay.

1 MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Yes, sure. Can you hear 2 me? CHAIRPERSON SIMON: 3 4 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Thank you. 5 MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Okay, good. Well, thank 6 you, everybody. This, as Aaron explained, it's a 7 subdivision of an oversized parcel where one house, one 8 present house, to stay. So after if this approval is 9 successful, we will be able to have three houses on the 10 same parcel. 11 So we're creating two new lots, building lots. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We meet all of the Zoning criteria. One small 250-foot long cul-de-sac, the area shown in green, will be paved as per the Town standards, a line of water, pressurized water, will be built into the cul-de-sac pending in a hydrant. And again, a sanitary sewer will also service the homes emanating from the center of cul-de-sac to the sanitary sewer that's on the street.

There are improvements to the drainage to the top of the page there. There is a significant number of drywells that will handle the storage of the 25-year storm. And it is way at the back of the parcels.

There are a significant number of trees being Every bit of, I believe, Aaron, remind me, if it's 20 or 40, I forget the number. But it's significant.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Let me just take a quick look here.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: And but we're proposing -
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: It's 49 regulated

trees proposed.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: 49. Some of them are sickly. Some of them probably need to be taken down, but by definition, we have to count them as healthy trees. We also are, like always, we propose a planting diagram and before the building permit is issued, a very exhaustive landscaping plan, there it is, has to be adhered to prior to any certificate of occupancy issuance.

So it is an inescapable fact that the trees that are there will mostly be substituted by newer, healthier, younger trees. That's it. In essence, it will be a new mini neighborhood. 2,000, probably 3,000 plus square foot homes occupying a space that is now pretty much open land without any purpose.

I feel it's a very successful subdivision. It fits in with the scale and the nature of the neighborhood. And I'm very hopeful that it will go through.

Anyway, just quickly mention to repeat what you said, we all felt that the excessive amount of pavement that is always needed for a turn-around for the vehicles, fire chief vehicles and the garbage and all that, it turns

out to be a 92-foot diameter paved surface.

And there are geometries that have been proposed and accepted by the Town of Greenburgh, I'm glad to say, that minimize the amount of pavement. And I truly encourage that. And I always think of doing that.

In this particular case, I did not think of it at the beginning, but one of the Members of the Board suggested that we try it. We did. And unfortunately, both the Y and the T intersections destroy the viability because of the setbacks, as you can see in that corner, destroys — there's absolutely no area left to build a house. That's the T and the Y, which is another attempt, different geometry, does the same type of intrusion into that second lot.

As you can see, it doesn't make it. The land, the shape of the land, is just not the right one for these types of intersections. Otherwise, I would, you know, it would -- if this was a squarer piece of land, it probably would work, but not with this unusual shape that we're dealing with. So we have --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Can I ask a question?

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Yes, yes, of course.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: And you may have mentioned this, I'm sorry. Is it due to basically the

1 stems that come out from either the Y or the T, that length of those that intrude into these lots? 2 MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Correct. 3 They have to be 60 feet. Because, in essence, that's the needed geometry. 4 5 I researched it. California, Idaho, Virginia, they all 6 have this very same dimension that we -- that we were -- I spoke to other engineers to see what they have done and we 7 8 have the same dimensions, all of us. 9 So I'm sure to say that this is the option that is being explored in many places. But it doesn't fit in 10 11 our geometry, certainly not. 12 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. 13 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Can I make a comment? 14 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Yes. BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Okay, Aaron, could you put 15 16 on the screen, you know, the image with the green showing 17 the pavement and the turn-around. Right. So I was out 18 there with Aaron a few weeks ago. 19 I mean everybody can see that the amount of 20 pavement for this 92-foot diameter turn-around, you know, I 21 would say is obscene. It requires the removal of many more 22 trees, obviously, to have a lot more impervious surface.

23

24

25

I'm disappointed, and I'm not blaming you. I'm

It requires, you know, substantially increased drainage.

think I made my point.

sure you tried. I'm disappointed that we couldn't do a hammer head or anything like that.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I agree. I feel like I was very surprised it didn't work. And it's because --

BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: It's all right, you explained it. And I accept at face value of what you said. Here's what I think. I think we just do a common driveway, which splits off, you know, to both of the houses.

And like in probably three or four dozen streets, in Edgemont, and probably in at least that many more in Greenburgh, let the garbage trucks back in or back out.

Let the fire trucks go in head first and somebody will back them out.

I am completely opposed to this arrangement. And I don't care what the fire department says. I've seen the fire department get in spaces you couldn't -- you didn't think you can get a Volkswagen bug into. They can do it. And they can do it here. There is plenty of room. So I am very much opposed to this 90-foot diameter turn-around.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Any other Board Members have a comment? I have a comment on this also, okay. I'll speak first. And then I will let the other Board Members.

You know, I'm in total agreement with Michael, that this 96-feet turn-around is just obscene. But I would like to see if something can be done so you don't have this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

circle and the trucks don't have to back out.

So one of the objects is that in the middle of the circle, you plant a tree and then you have mountable curbs around it. So the trucks will still be able to go around in that area without backing in. And you have -you just don't have this massive piece of empty circle there, that you have a tree in the middle, a mountable curb. So that's another way we can go. Any other Board Members have an idea?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yeah, first of all, Aaron, refresh my memory, we have an issue with a cul-de-sac in one spot where the fire district wanted something. It wasn't a Greenburgh Fire Department, it was Ardsley, I think, wanted something much larger than, I think it was this size, and we did something to mitigate that. Could you refresh our memory what we did, please?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes. So I believe that was in the Village of Irvington. It was a cul-de-sac to service, I think, four or five new homes. Actually, you know, our Town Code says that cul-de-sac diameter shall be 80 feet.

What that particular fire department had indicated was that there is actually a requirement in the Fire Code for a 96-foot diameter and 90-foot diameter paved cul-de-sac.

What the Planning Board did with respect to that application was, it did request and the applicant agreed, to put in a center island with mountable curbs similar to what Chairperson Simon had mentioned as a potential alternative here with vegetation in the center to break up some of the, you know, pavement, the 96 or 92-foot diameter pavement, and break it up with some landscaping and reduce the impervious coverage with respect to that. So that is an option.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: One other option I think we have is grass pavers. You can reduce a diameter significantly if around the edge of the cul-de-sac you use grass pavers. The complaint we normally get about grass pavers is when we try to do them in a parking lot is the maintenance.

This isn't going to be utilized that heavily that you couldn't do grass pavers, except to the entrance to the driveway, for example, and still have that same effect. So maybe you do a combination of the two. Because Michael and Walter are 100 percent right on this, I believe. For three houses, this is absolutely just too much, too much asphalt.

BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: It's actually two houses. The third existing house has its own driveway.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, then I stand corrected, Michael, thank you. So it's only two houses.

But what about using grass pavers? 1 2 FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: If I may make one comment just in general. The way this is proposed is 3 to be a street that is going to be dedicated to the Town. 4 5 So I just want the Planning Board to be aware that 6 maintenance, if it's dedicated to the Town, it will become 7 Town responsibility. VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Still shouldn't be 8 9 that hard. FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: I'm just 10 11 talking to you about cost. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I understand. FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: I want the 13 Board to be fully aware. 14 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: David, how could that be a 15 16 street. It's on private property. That's not a street. 17 FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: It could be the cul-de-sac. The intent is for it to be a cul-de-sac 18 19 and the subdivision lines show that this would be, that 20 this is going to be a public street from what I understand. 21 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: I stand by my original 22 point. I think it should be a driveway. I think it should 23 be a normal size and, you know, any truck going in there 24 can figure out how to do it. 25

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I can suggest one item,

Michael, with respect to what you just said. And it's up to legal to respond to it in the sense that we can adjust the driveway significantly so that the portion that is paved from the main stem for the so-called road would almost give me the same geometry as that Y intersection of 60 feet from the center if I allowed the driveways to be part of that geometry.

The only negative aspect of that is that God forbid there is a fire and there are cars parked on the driveway legally, then it would be blocking the turn-around possibility of the larger vehicle.

Also, I think that the fire chiefs will not go into shallow driveways like this. And they fight the fire from the road. That's my understanding of other fire people I've spoken to. They will not go into the cul-de-sac.

BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: I don't believe that for a second. They'll get as close as they can particularly to the hydrant. There will be a new hydrant in there.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Aaron, don't we have an issue at that point with the length of the driveway, which code? Which code to the driveway?

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: 250, I would have to have --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Right. We will

look at the code. I believe it's six times. I'll have to double-check it and I can report that back to the Board and communicate that with Mr. Escaladas.

One thing I did want to speak to with respect to what Mr. Escaladas had suggested is that the Planning Board in a prior subdivision did permit an applicant to utilize a portion of its hammer head as within a private driveway subject to an easement. And that may be something that could be done in this instance as well. And I'll be happy to share that information with Mr. Escaladas.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Moving forward, we have about three suggestions that were made. The one that you said about the hammer head. The other is to just makes the streets and let the trucks back in and out.

And the other one is to make the turn-around 80 feet and with some planting and mountable curb or grass pavers in the middle to make it porous and allow the trucks to go over.

I know fire chiefs said, well, porous pavers, they are not strong enough, but how often is a fire truck going around that. It's not as if they are traveling back and forth. I would like to see, you know, I think we have -- if the Board feels comfortable, I do, is to put this on for Public Hearing, that prior to the Public Hearing you provide plans for an 80-foot driveway with the

porous pavements and the trees in the middle. The other plan which connecting the driveways. And the other one is with the idea of the hammer head.

And then we will have that information. And at the Public Hearing, you can present it and then the Board will have the opportunity to review it. And then we can indicate which one we feel is best suited for this site.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Okay, thank you,
Chairperson Simon. I just want to mention two things. So
one being that we do have members of the public that are
here and, I believe, wish to speak.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Yes.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Also, Mr. Desai has indicated that he did have a question as well.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay, fine.

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: I also, if I can, the one question that I will have for Mr. Escaladas is that the proposal mentioned, if any of the proposals change the dimensions of the subdivision, such as the one for a driveway or something, that should be addressed as we go forward, not today.

But we're going to hear from the public now, and maybe have a road map of where we're going to go or maybe have different alternatives. So if that's going to change anything with respect to the lot line, we should know that.

1	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: What do you mean by that?
2	I don't get it.
3	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Well,
4	Mr. Golden had suggested a one driveway that runs off. In
5	that case, we would not have the cul-de-sac of the road.
6	Those would be normally private driveways and that would
7	change presumably the lot lines.
8	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Yes, but we were doing
9	that with an easement, which makes sense to me.
10	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Well, I just
11	want clarification on that.
12	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Yes.
13	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Yes. By definition, the
14	lots may even increase its size because now the paved
15	surface, it goes down. It goes further away and the
16	property line, the right of way, increases for the lot. So
17	I understand that. I understand what you're saying, yes.
18	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Okay.
19	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay.
20	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Desai had a
21	question.
22	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Is there any more questions
23	by the Board? Kirit, yes.
24	BOARD MEMBER HAY: I would like to speak after
25	Kirit.

1	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Go ahead.
2	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Emilio, can you go back to
3	the tree removal plan, please?
4	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Okay.
5	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Sure. I will do.
6	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Yeah. Okay, Aaron, yeah.
7	My concern is that why you are removing all the trees all
8	along that corner?
9	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Up here?
10	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Yeah.
11	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: That's all drainage. All
12	the drainage is going there. That's the low point of the
13	property.
14	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Yeah, but the trees are
15	there now and it will remain there so why
16	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: We have to put subsurface
17	features, Cultec. So we have to excavate three to
18	four feet in that area in order to place the volume of
19	these devices.
20	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: But if I look at the plan,
21	you have a Cultec on the left-hand side.
22	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: They are all over the
23	place. So some for the homes and some for the road.
24	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: So why can't you
25	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Right. So

Mr. Desai, so one of the requirements is when you construct a new roadway, and this could change if they are able to cut down on the pavement. But with the new roadway, the Town Code says well, you can't, the runoff coming off this new pavement, it can't just be directed out into the existing property, he has to capture it and treat it.

So what he's proposing was to put in catch basins, then tie it through an easement and put it into a series of drywells. Correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: My question is, why can't he put some Cultec where your left of that. That's all. I mean, it's yeah, over there, yeah. So that he do not have to remove some of the trees.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I always, I always try to keep the water as far away from the future homes and the basement. The longer the horizontal distance and the more soil I have between the source of water and the basement, the better for the home. It's a longterm issue, but I like to address it now.

And a lot of those trees, by the way, are not in very good or excellent shape. They are kind of pines.

They are not in good health. I'm not at all -- I love trees, I would not -- if those were 38-inch Oaks, I would do my best to stay away from them, but they are not. They

are sickly trees and I don't have any sadness to replace them.

Actually, we are going to be replacing a lot of these trees with newer trees. The amount of planting is significant. And as we all know, when we introduce a newer tree, it's a betterment for all of the area. I just feel -- and also, in a way, it gives that backyard a little bit more of an esthetic openness. That's the other issue that took over my design.

But I guess I could, if the Board insists, I could. I just don't like to put water sources near any of the houses, it doesn't make any sense.

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: But if I understand correctly, the side slopes away from the proposed house. So but anyway, I was trying to save some more trees.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I understand. I understand.

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: And to kind of accommodate the drainage issue, but --

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: It's a big footprint for the drainage issue. I think even if we push it over to the left, by the time we excavate, and we may not even be able to save it because then the roots of the trees will be cut. So I think we're wishing something we probably may not achieve.

1	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay.
2	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: I believe Mr. Hay
3	had a question.
4	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Tom?
5	BOARD MEMBER HAY: Yes, hi. Two things. One, I
6	want to be clear on the options that we're asking
7	Mr. Escaladas to do. And the second
8	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Me too, me too, by the
9	way.
10	BOARD MEMBER HAY: is to understand, you know,
11	how realistic it is that we can get those approved with the
12	fire department. Because I don't want any applicant to do
13	unnecessary work. So what I heard for the options was one,
14	where it's just a long driveway that extends from the
15	street to the two homes.
16	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Right.
17	BOARD MEMBER HAY: One was a smaller cul-de-sac
18	closer to 80 feet than the 90 plus.
19	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Right.
20	BOARD MEMBER HAY: The third I heard hammer head,
21	but I'm not sure what that one is. And whoever proposes
22	it, if you could repeat that.
23	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Let me repeat that one. I
24	believe that the hammer head would be similar geometry to
	1

that or that, but that the end edge would become, in

essence, the driveways to the homes. So we doubled up in function. We have the geometry that we need for the fire truck and the width. So that geometry stays.

But the property line ends where we have it, and the setbacks, which is the offensive aspect of this proposal doesn't decrease the buildable envelope of the lots. So, in essence, we would leave the property right of way lines where they are and the driveway, and the driveway, in essence, will be the Y geometry for the turn-around. That we can achieve.

BOARD MEMBER HAY: Okay.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: That's the drawing, that's in the drawing that we're looking at right now, could serve as that option, that third option, where the lot that is to the right will be -- that driveway will end at the garage of the house.

I think I can squeeze a house with that particular geometry. I'll try it. I'll look at it from the point of view how I would build a house with that road geometry, but I think we can do that.

BOARD MEMBER HAY: Okay, that makes sense to me. That was my thought when I looked at this because that would save you the setback question. Then, my next question, which is probably to David Fried, okay, the fire department, from what I'm understanding I'm hearing

tonight, the fire department prefers or requires, requests a big cul-de-sac turn-around. We're going to propose a couple of things that are not that. Who has jurisdiction here?

FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Okay, well, let's start with -- I'm not sure that the fire department proposed. What was proposed was a cul-de-sac. And in order to do the cul-de-sac, the applicant has to be consistent with New York State Law, which requires that, and the fire department is rather, you know, adheres to that.

If Mr. Escaladas prepares a different diagram, we do want to hear from the fire department to determine what their view is. If, however, everything is to code, if the fire department is not thrilled with it, but it meets

New York Code, we can approve in the fashion that that is part of the application.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: That is correct. That's my understanding as well.

BOARD MEMBER HAY: Right. Thank you.

MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I took an area of the -- and keep this drawing. If you look at this drawing and you see the difference between the circular pattern of the cul-de-sac, that one, and you visually compare it to the dark area that sticks in to the lot to the right, the Y

1 went from there.

That area, if you subtract it from the quarter pie area on the left, it only leaves you a savings -- in other words, the savings that we would do was not significant. It was probably around 1500 square feet, which is no joke. It does save us about that much and four trees. I did not say that at the beginning. The advantage of having this type of arrangement.

And if we can now make this a little bit not as wide and treat this as the driveway, I may be able to, and maybe push it forward, and reshape all three lots, I may be able to incorporate this geometry and leave a buildable envelope for homes. I think we can do it. Let me try it.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Would any other Board Member like to speak on this issue? If not, is there anyone from the public who would like to speak on this issue?

MR. MURRAY BODIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Yes.

MR. MURRAY BODIN: My name is Murray Bodin. I live at 101 Joyce Road in Hartsdale, which is at the end of the cul-de-sac that has ten houses on it. Been here over 40 years. In the 40 years that we've been here, no garbage truck has ever turned around. Everyone has backed up the hill, up a hill, with a curve, successfully. Never saw an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

accident.

I agree with Michael that a cul-de-sac in this area just is not appropriate. This is a post-virus world we live in. And many of the rules that were established 50 years, 100 years ago, are no longer applicable. A short driveway, garbage truck would pull in and back out. Even the new one-armed garbage trucks, the cans would be on one side and they would successfully do it.

The newer garbage truck is the only one that can turn around in our cul-de-sac. And it takes him five minutes to make six different things until he gets around it because he has to have the arm on the other side.

The other question I have is whether or not you're going to put in curbs and sidewalks. It is my opinion that curbs are racist. They serve no useful purpose. They hinder a walker. And this issue of curbs especially on the 119 be construction.

I have started to challenge New York State DOT on their regulations on the roads. The small of that driveway without a cul-de-sac would work very well. It has worked in 100s of locations in Westchester County.

We have to think new. We have less resources than we had before. There are fire districts and no consistency between fire districts. What one fire district finds acceptable, the next one doesn't, which now raises

1	the question is why we have any fire districts. Because in
2	Hartsdale we have one police department, multiple fire
3	districts and the cost of money paying for these additional
4	chiefs is outrageous.
5	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Mr. Bodin, could you
6	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Mr. Bodin,
7	please
8	MR. MURRAY BODIN: Do I have the floor or do I
9	have the floor?
10	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: With respect
11	to this application, please.
12	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Mr. Bodin
13	MR. MURRAY BODIN: My question is
14	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Please.
15	MR. MURRAY BODIN: With my request
16	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Please. Okay, just please
17	talk to the issue that's before us.
18	MR. MURRAY BODIN: Yes. Before us
19	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: On this application, okay.
20	MR. MURRAY BODIN: Yes. Before us is a driveway.
21	My question is there curbs and sidewalks involved with
22	whatever is put in?
23	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: The design submitted does
24	not show sidewalls. However, the curbs are needed to
25	create a causeway for the stormwater and direct it to the

1	drainage low point. It's really a control of the flow of
2	the water. If we didn't have the curb, the water then
3	would exfiltrate on to each individual property creating
4	maybe water problems and icy problems in the winter.
5	So there is a real engineering issue about that.
6	The sidewalks, of course, that's a social issue to be
7	decided by each buildings. I have not been required to
8	have one here. So we didn't put one in. That's a social
9	issue, that depends on the Board how they feel about this.
10	But the curb is, unfortunately, I wouldn't know
11	how to direct the water to where I have to take it if I
12	didn't have a curb flow on the edge of the road.
13	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Are there any other,
14	anyone else
15	MR. MURRAY BODIN: Can I ask another question?
16	Is it possible for me to have a visit to the site?
17	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Sure.
18	MR. MURRAY BODIN: Who do I have to see to
19	arrange a visit?
20	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Speak to Aaron Schmidt.
21	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: You may speak with
22	me. You can send me an email about that, Mr. Bodin.
23	MR. MURRAY BODIN: Thank you, Aaron.
24	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Anyone else who would
25	like to speak to this issue?

(Whereupon, there was no response.) 1 2 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: If not, I would like to make that we don't close the hearing but adjourn the hearing and 3 give Mr. Escaladas the opportunity to look at the three 4 5 different plans that we had in front of us. 6 And how long do you think, how much work is involved to do that, if you do the consolidation, if you 7 will, of those driveways into a so-called hammer; the idea 8 9 of 80-foot turn-around with porous pavers, mountable curbs and a tree in the middle? 10 MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Well, yeah, I understand. 11 12 It's a question of just starting. I can have it, I 13 believe, by the next meeting. You'll have a chance to review it so that you can opine on the next meeting. I'll 14 do my best. 15 16 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Would you be able 17 to have it into us within one week from this evening? 18 MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I have to say yes because 19 my client is listening. 20 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Emilio, please don't forget 21 my idea of the simple shared driveway where trucks have to 22 back up. 23 MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I would prefer that one. 24 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: What? 25 MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I would prefer that one.

1	I will shoot for that one myself. If I have the power,
2	that's what we would do.
3	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Good.
4	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. So if you can prepare
5	those three
6	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: examples, and, you know,
8	you tell and you give us the reason why you prefer
9	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I will.
10	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: one above the other, and
11	the reasons why.
12	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I'm of the opinion
13	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: And you will have all the
14	information, the plus and minuses, and then we can go from
15	there, okay?
16	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: I'm 72 years old. I've
17	done a lot of subdivisions. I agree with the zeal, that
18	the subdivisions should be done in scale for two houses to
19	have this gigantic pavement, I do agree with the Board,
20	it's too much. We are simply trying to find a way to
21	satisfy the fire chiefs and I think we can satisfy
22	ourselves, if it was left to us.
23	But the fire chiefs are very specific and I don't

want to put legal into a difficult position or the Town

Public Works in a difficult position. We have to be wise

24

1	about that. And we have to get their nod as well. I'm
2	ready to miniaturize this pavement, absolutely.
3	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Thank you,
4	Mr. Escaladas.
5	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. I have a motion to
6	adjourn this Public Hearing until
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: September 16th.
8	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: the 16th?
9	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: So moved.
10	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: You feel you'd be prepared by
11	that?
12	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: I can make it later.
14	MR. EMILIO ESCALADAS: Yes, no, we're good.
15	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. I make a proposal to
16	adjourn the Public Hearing to September 16th.
17	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: So moved.
18	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: Michael
19	already made the motion. We need a second.
20	BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Second.
21	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Mona second. All in favor?
22	Aye.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Aye.
24	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Aye.
25	BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Aye.

1	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Aye.
2	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Aye.
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	* * * * * * * * *
12	
13	Case No. PB 20-08
14	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. Motion to close the
15	Public Hearing?
16	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: No, we have
17	not discussed
18	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Oh, okay, we have to
19	adjourn
20	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: We still have
21	Greystone.
22	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: We have to adjourn Greystone,
23	right. Okay.
24	FIRST DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY FRIED: If you want to
25	set it up.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes. So this is
CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. We went through the
background, how it came about being on the agenda after we
had said that we would not put something on the agenda
until the applicant is ready. When the applicant feels
that they would absolutely be able to have a written
document that says that the Town of Tarrytown is satisfied.
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Right. So
Chairperson Simon and Members of the Board, just for the

Chairperson Simon and Members of the Board, just for the record, this is Case Number PB 20-08.

CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: The

Greystone-on-Hudson. As indicated by the Chairman, the

applicant did submit a letter and requesting an

adjournment. It was under everyone's impression that they

had satisfied the Village of Tarrytown's request.

Only after Town staff reaching out to the Village to see if they had any interest in joining in on this Public Hearing did we find out that the Village of Tarrytown was now requesting additional information or additional testing by the applicant.

So the applicant indicated to me that the testing will start tomorrow. It's a two-week testing period. And he requested in his email that, you know, just so that there is enough time, he's not asking to be put on two

1 weeks from now. He's asking to be put on five weeks from 2 now, which is October 7th. He's already re-noticed for this meeting and that was the request of the applicant. 3 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: So I move that we adjourn 4 it to October 7th. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Michael moved that we adjourn to October 7th. Do we have a second? 7 8 BOARD MEMBER HAY: Second. 9 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Tom second. All in favor? 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Can we have a 11 discussion first, Walter? I disagree. 12 CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay. 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: And the reason I 14 disagree is very simple. We have now postponed this, I 15 think, five times. I think that's how many times we've done it. I don't think we should schedule this until there 16 17 is a letter, period. It's gone on and on and on. 18 So I think this a very bad idea to schedule it 19 It should be open until we get written confirmation now. 20 from the Village of Tarrytown that they've accomplished 21 whatever they need to do with the Village of Tarrytown. 22 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Let me ask Aaron something. Can we adjourn it to a date to be determined? 23 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ:

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Well, and I believe

that's what Mr. Schwartz is asking the Board to consider. The Board can do that. It would require the applicant to re-notice a third time.

Now, which, you know, the Board may absolutely put it off to a date uncertain. The concern I have is that I'm just, I'm not 100 percent sure that we will get something in writing from the Village. And if it carries on so long, it's going to hurt this applicant in trying to move forward. So that's just a concern that I wanted to bring to the Board's attention.

BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Hold on. I hear what you say. On the other hand, I don't think this is the applicant's fault. I stand by my original motion, if they are not ready on October, whatever it is, 16th.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: 7th.

BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: 7th, it will take two minutes to adjourn it again. This is not a burden on us. And I think the applicant has already been burdened enough. You know, maybe justifiably so, I have no idea. I don't know what's going on.

I would just adjourn it to October 7th. If the applicant isn't ready, it will take us one minute, we don't spend 15 minutes discussing it, to adjourn it to another date.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: We do have a motion

1	in effect.
2	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Wait a minute. Any other
3	comment before we move the motion?
4	(Whereupon, there was no response)
5	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: If not, I call all those in
6	favor to adjourning it to October 7th?
7	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Aye.
8	BOARD MEMBER HAY: Aye.
9	BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Aye.
10	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Aye.
11	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: All right, aye. All those
13	oppose?
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: No.
15	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Hugh Schwartz opposed.
16	Abstain?
17	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
18	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay, motion carried. Okay,
19	motion to now close the Public Hearing?
20	BOARD MEMBER HAY: So moved.
21	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Moved by Thomas Hay. Do we
22	have a second?
23	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Second.
24	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Second by Michael Golden.
25	All those in favor in aloging the Dublic Hearing please

	case No. 12 19 23
1	indicate?
2	BOARD MEMBER HAY: Aye.
3	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Aye.
4	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Aye.
5	BOARD MEMBER FRAITAG: Aye.
6	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Aye.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Aye.
8	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Oppose?
9	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
10	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Abstain?
11	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
12	CHAIRPERSON SIMON: Okay.
13	(Whereupon, the Planning Board Public Hearing was
14	concluded.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Case No. PB 19-25 CERTIFICATION Certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the stenographic minutes conducted via Zoom taken by the undersigned, to the best of her ability. Barbara Marciante Barbara Marciante, Official Court Reporter