1	TOWN OF GREENBURGH PLANNING BOARD
2	x 1. ROLL CALL
3	
4	5. ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING/PUBLIC DISCUSSION
5	¥
6	a. CASE NO. PB 20-09 Lightbridge Academy
7	529 West Central Park Avenue
8	(P.O. Scarsdale, N.Y.)
9	
10	ADJOURNMENT.
11	X
12	Greenburgh Town Hall 177 Hillside Avenue
13	Greenburgh, New York 10607 July 1, 2024
14	
15	
16	HYBRID PLANNING BOARD MEETING
17	
18	
19	
20	BARBARA MARCIANTE, Official Court Reporter
21	Official Court Reported
22	RECEIVED
23	NEOLIVED
24	JUL 15 2024
25	TOWN OF GREENBURGH DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY

**DEVELOPMENT & CONSERVATION** 

1	
2	
3	APPEARANCES:
4	
5	HUGH SCHWARTZ, CHAIRPERSON THOMAS HAY, VICE CHAIRPERSON
6	THOMAS HAI, VICE CHAIRPERSON
7	WALTER SIMON, Board Member KIRIT DESAI, Board Member
8	MICHAEL GOLDEN, Board Member(Not Present) LESLIE DAVIS, Board Member
9	JOHAN SNAGGS, Board Member AISHA SPARKS, Alternate Board Member
10	AISHA SPARKS, AICEINACE BOAIG MEMBEI
11	JOSEPH DANKO, Town Attorney
12	
13	AADON CCUMIDE
14	AARON SCHMIDT, Deputy Commissioner of The Department of
15	Community Development and Conservation
16	
17	MATTHEW BRITTON, Town Planner, Department of
18	Community Development and Conservation
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: We're going to start the
2	Public Hearing portion of our meeting tonight.
3	Mr. Schmidt, please call the roll.
4	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Chairperson
5	Schwartz?
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Here.
7	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Simon?
8	BOARD MEMBER SIMON: Here.
9	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Hay?
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Here.
l1	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Snaggs?
12	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Here.
L3	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Desai?
L4	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Here.
L 5	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Ms. Davis?
L 6	BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: Here.
L7	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: And our alternate,
L8	Ms. Sparks?
L 9	ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Here.
20	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Golden is not
21	present this evening.
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: And Ms. Sparks is a voting
23	member, therefore, because Mr. Golden isn't here.
24	We are here PB Case 20-09, Light Bridge Academy
25	at 529 Central Avenue. It's amendment to a Site Plan and a

1.0

Special Use Permit Approval. The background of this is this is a project that we approved years ago. But at the time, we weren't sure what the impact would be from a traffic and parking point of view.

So what we have done is we said at the time is run the Academy, see what happens, do another traffic study for us and -- or analysis for us, not necessarily a study, analysis for us. And then come back to us if you want to do full enrollment. And that's where we are tonight.

What I would like to do, there are some issues that have come up that aren't directly related to the increase, unfortunately, that we need to discuss tonight, and we will do that.

But what I would like to do first is have you do the presentation. I would like to follow that -- Who do we have from, Ms. Connell from Kimley-Horn, our traffic consultants, is with us tonight via Zoom. So what we're going to do is have you do your presentation. Let Kimley-Horn give their assessment of the traffic impact of this.

And then there is some discussions, I know they were brought up by members of the community that we need to address as well. Since we're revising the thing, we might as well clean everything up at once, and that's what we want to do. So why don't you present the project first.

You have to give your name first and --

MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Yes. Good evening,
Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, Town Staff. My name is
Mathew Dudley, attorney with the law firm of Harris Beach,
PLLC., Counsel for the applicant, 529 Central Park Avenue,
LLC.

As Chairman Schwartz explained, tonight we are here for a Public Hearing for an Amended Site Plan and Special Permit Approval. We were last before your Board in 2020 when we obtained a Special Permit Site Plan Approval and other approvals. And at that time, the applicant, 529 Central Park Avenue, agreed to limit its enrollment.

The site is for a child daycare facility that's operating as Lightbridge Academy, agreed to freeze its enrollment for at 105 FTE children, that's full time equivalent children. Meaning, one child, full time, the entire week. Or two children, one child, Monday, Wednesday, Friday; the other, Tuesday, Thursday. Or two children, one in the morning, one in the afternoon.

And like I said, we agreed to freeze our enrollment at 105 FTE children. And at the time that we neared that amount to conduct a supplemental traffic impact study and site-wide plan parking utilization study calculation, which we have done. And that's the reason for us being before your Board tonight.

We appeared before your Board last month at the June 5th Planning Board meeting for a Work Session. The Planning Board issued a recommendation, a positive recommendation, to the Zoning Board in furtherance of our application before that Board for one area variance, for offering less than the minimum required number of off-street parking spaces.

We appeared before the ZBA at its June 20th meeting for a Public Hearing on that area variance application. The Zoning Board closed the Public Hearing and it's on for decision at its next meeting in, I believe that's late July.

So let me just explain, as I previously mentioned, Colliers Engineering is the applicant's engineer of record. I believe we have on video Matt Ryan, who is filling in for Jesse Cokeley today and also Michelle Briehof, who is the traffic consultant with Colliers.

We submitted that updated traffic study and site-wide parking utilization calculation, which was reviewed by the Town Staff and outside consultant from Kimley-Horn, Mr. John Canning. Mr. Canning issued a Memorandum interpreting and giving his comments to those studies as well as the time lapse video that the applicant provided of the parking lot on, I think it was, March 12th, 2024, to show the traffic patterns of cars pulling into the

site, parking to drop off children and leaving the site.

And it gives a good idea of the amount of traffic that currently exists at the property when we're nearing close to 105 FTE children currently. Kimley-Horn's Memorandum, just to summarize it, basically said that they believed, based on the studies, that the parking is working well for the site and that they see no reason why to not grant the requested Amended Special Permit and Site Plan Application that's before your Board now.

If you have any questions for me, I'm happy to answer them now. Or if you would like to ask any more specific questions for the engineers that we have virtually, we welcome your questions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I think, at this point, what I would like to do is have our traffic consultant give their opinion. Then come back to the Board's questions and then, obviously, if there are people in the audience who —
I know there was at least one piece of correspondence or two pieces, I'm sorry, two pieces of correspondence that we received. At least one of the people I see in the audience tonight. I don't know if the other one is here or not. So I want them to speak as well as anybody else in the public. But right now, why don't we go to Ms. Connell.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Who is standing in for John Canning.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right.

2.5

MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Correct.

MS. ANDREA CONNELL: Good evening. I'm Andrea Connell with Kimley-Horn. Yes, so we looked at the updated traffic study and it looked at new counts at the driveways. It conducted counts at the driveways -- the driveway, sorry. And it also counted the parking lot to see what the parking demand would be.

And our study found that the traffic counts of the driveway showed that the trip rate of the daycare center is actually lower than what was projected in the original study back in 2020. So the original study was conservative from a traffic generation standpoint.

And the parking counts that they did identified 18 vehicles parked at the peak time. And they projected that to the future to, you know, with the full enrollment of 152 students and found that there would be, I think, up to 37 peak demand for parking. So sufficient parking we found based on their counts and their traffic study.

The other question that I think is regarding the employee spaces, if you want to discuss that now?

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Sure.

MS. ANDREA CONNELL: There were -- there's three spaces that were originally thought, which would put them near the area of the greatest activity with the drop-off

and pick-up at the facility. You know, the three, yeah, right there, employee parking spaces.

So the video that was shared by the applicant essentially showed that it's really only parents that are using those spaces, not employees. And given that there was no observed issues with parents using that as a drop-off area, we thought that that restriction to employee only could be lifted and just use for parent drop-off and pick-up.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. ANDREA CONNELL: So essentially, as

Mr. Dudley said, we did find that based on the studies they

provided the analysis, that it would appear that allowing

the increased enrollment would be acceptable.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Connell, appreciate it. Thank you for being here tonight.

MS. ANDREA CONNELL: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Should we bring up the other questions now? I wonder if we should have Mr. Senor come up now and discuss.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Then we could discuss all the questions at once.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: And then we will discuss all the questions at once. Okay?

VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: And then if the Board has anything beyond that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes. Are there any questions from the Board for Ms. Connell?

BOARD MEMBER SIMON: No.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Mr. Senor, if you can come up and discuss what you had done. Thank you.

MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yes. Eliot Senor, engineer/surveyor here for the neighbor at 531 Central Park Avenue, the property at the front. We don't really have a lot of problems with using it as Lightbridge or the variances that are sought. There are a couple of issues that we do have take exception to.

One of them is that they are not based the site plan on an as-built condition. We know that from the pictures that we sent, the guardrail wasn't built as originally proposed. It's not halfway up. They since extended it on this to a point closer to the corner.

But if the guardrail is there to protect cars from going over the wall, why isn't it the full amount?

The reason being is because as you get closer to the corner, you're going to reduce that area to less than

24 feet, maybe 20, 21 feet. And they don't want to lose

1 that parking in the front. But I think that would be the proper thing to do, 2 is to lose that -- those parking spaces and have them ask 3 for a bigger variance. They are probably going to get it. 4 It's not like, as the report show, that they need the 5 space. 6 And that picture, what's submitted, isn't the 7 8 as-built condition. That wall in one of the pictures that we submitted is more of a curve than a 90-degree turn. And 9 it's already been hit by something without the benefit of 10 11 the guardrail. 12 So we're really not sure why they don't want to extend that guardrail to protect all the cars. The closest 13 part is that corner where there is more susceptible for 14 15 going over the wall so. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: How high is the wall? MR. ELIOT SENOR: It's about six feet, four to 17 six feet. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: So how would they go over 20 it? MR. ELIOT SENOR: Well, they are backing up from 21 those spaces without the benefit of protection from --22 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The wall, is the retaining 23

24

25

wall facing -
MR. ELIOT SENOR: The parking lot side is only a

1	couple inches above the curve.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: So it's six feet over
3	MR. ELIOT SENOR: Our side is the lower side.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Is that true all
5	the way up to the front? I thought it got flatter
6	MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yeah. I mean, as you go down
7	the driveway, it becomes a zero. But as you go
8	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Do you know how far down
9	the driveway, where that happens?
10	MR. ELIOT SENOR: How far down the driveway?
11	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: At this point
12	MR. ELIOT SENOR: It's probably halfway between
13	the end of the wall and the stop line.
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay.
15	MR. ELIOT SENOR: In that area.
16	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I take it at this point,
17	if someone is coming down there, say, at night or something
18	and jumping the curb and then
19	MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yeah, or in the wintertime,
20	3:00 when it's getting dark.
21	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Or skidding off of that.
22	MR. ELIOT SENOR: Right. So we're not really
23	sure why they don't want to bring that all the way around,
24	except that they'll lose some more parking spaces.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: I mean, it raises a

1	question in my mind, can there be a guardrail on the wall
2	or some other
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Build up on the wall.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: you know, mechanism to
5	keep it safer, without extending into the parking lot?
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right.
7	MR. ELIOT SENOR: Good question.
8	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Good question. All
9	good questions. And we do have our building inspector's
10	office reviewing the matter. We're going to have
11	coordination amongst the building inspector's office, this
12	Board, as well as the applicant. So continue to stay in
13	touch with my office and we will give you updates as they
14	are available.
15	MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yeah. Just to add a little bit
16	of background. This is a segmental block wall, and so it
17	has no real structural stability. The structure that
18	retains the dirt is the geogrid, the fabric behind it.
	So there is no actual rigidity of the wall. The
19	
19 20	blocks aren't even cemented in place. Maybe the top course
	blocks aren't even cemented in place. Maybe the top course is glued on, but the rest of the blocks are just gravity.
20	
20 21	is glued on, but the rest of the blocks are just gravity.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Or they can replace that

25

1 section with something else.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: They don't have to replace the whole wall. Or could they drill down just at the edge of the wall to hit?

MR. ELIOT SENOR: Well, generally the manufacturer says that any guardrail should be three feet away from the face because there is no real resistance from a fenced post.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: All right.

MR. ELIOT SENOR: Their engineer could certify whatever he is capable of certifying to whatever he wants. But we just don't understand why they don't protect the entire wall from, you know, mishaps.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Anything else, Eliot?

MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yes. The other thing was, we're not really -- we don't -- Yes, oh, the crosswalk that goes to no where. So there is a cross walk there, a painted crosswalk. It ends in a parking space. I'm not sure how people are going to walk up the sidewalk, walk across that, and then into nothing.

It wouldn't be that much of a problem to either guide it to the area where the handicap spot is and create that as a walkway. But right now it ends right behind the car that's going to be backing out and not seeing anybody

1 in the crosswalk.

If they end up removing some of those parking spaces, you'll have more space for a walkway to get to the actual vestibule area, that front patio, you know. It may have been approved that way, but that doesn't mean that we want to continue to --

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MR. ELIOT SENOR: -- have a problem with that.

And then I guess the only other question was, when they did their time lapse video on March 12th, how many students were actually in the building at that time? I don't really see that in there.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The applicant will answer that one.

MR. ELIOT SENOR: Those were it. I mean, it's -we don't necessarily object to the project. If they wanted
to get a bigger variance, we're not objecting to that, for
them getting a variance for parking spaces.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Thank you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Before we go on, I want to make something clear. Okay, thank you. Given that we don't really have an as-built plan in front of us now, one thing that we're going -- an as-built survey, I'm sorry, in

front of us, what we're doing now is not what actually -DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: It doesn't
representing existing conditions.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: So because of that, we will be -- We will have to hold this over no matter what we have tonight. I just want to get that clear tonight.

We're going to holding it over until we have those plans and the building inspector reviewed those plans as well.

So it will be held over. I just wanted to get that through.

Ms. Connell, can you speak to the question

Mr. Senor had about the crosswalk from your perspective,

please?

MS. ANDREA CONNELL: Sure. Looking at that video, we saw nobody that entire day using that crosswalk. You know, the crosswalk, basically, it's a couple things. So it warns drivers that are passing that way that there could be pedestrians within the crosswalk.

And then it also can be used as a guide for pedestrians, like this is where you should cross. So I know there were suggestions maybe making it go a little further to the west and then connecting into where the handicap striping is. But we found, you know, as you know, people cut the corners, so they are going to go to a point where you can enter the building.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: So it's there, basically, as a way of slowing the cars down, is what you're saying.

MS. ANDREA CONNELL: Yeah. It's a notification that this is a pedestrian crossing. We didn't see a lot of -- We didn't see any pedestrians on that day, you know. Maybe other days had more pedestrians. But we did not see any. And we have not heard of any issues with pedestrians crossing.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you,

Ms. Connell. Before we go to the public, are there any
other questions right now from the Board?

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Yeah, I have a question.
CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Kirit, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: I think there is other way to put the guardrails on this existing wall. They can sort of modify it or they can put the steel or the pipe structures to kind of get them -- get all this load off of the actual kind of wall.

And yes, I agree we Senor that most of these segmented walls are not meant to hold any railing to a point where the purpose is to stop the cars from hitting it.

For people, yeah, they do that. It's about 200 feet a criteria for the wall. So that there, they allow it. But for this one, I think the best thing is to

have some sort of additional modification that allows them to put this guardrail on the wall, which will be more effective in any case. Or just build it up 10 feet high so that the cars would hit that one, other than the things.

And I agree that if there is the three parking spots are, from the beginning, was really very questionable for backing in, backing out. And while it going to be providing us with more information, it may be a good idea to look into it.

And I agree with Senor, that additional couple of cars variance would not make any difference considering there is only 18 cars is what they see occupied.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Currently.

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Currently, yes. So if 26 is provided, I understand.

MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: If I may just respond to that briefly. Initially, when the applicant applied for a building permit to construct the retaining wall, the initial design had intended to put a guide rail on top of within the wall, the protruding, you know, above the elevation of the wall. The manufacturer of the wall did not recommend that.

So they made a field change to place the guide rail on our side of the property in front of that retaining wall. And that necessitated the need to shorten the guide

rail due to the width of the drive aisle.

The building permit was issued and the wall and guide rail were installed prior to the Building

Department's final inspection for this Certificate of

Occupancy in October of 2022.

So the building inspector had that before then when they issued the CO.

BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Yeah, but your engineers would understand what Senor was saying. And since he's also an engineer and he understands that.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I think given what we've heard and looking at the picture, something needs to be done, okay. I think there are probably creative solutions that could be done without -- I rather not see you have a variance. 24 feet is a Town standard road.

And you have people going in and out at the same time. So you know, you can get away with 20 feet, but why do you want to do that if you don't have to.

I think you need to talk to your engineers as well as our Department, if there is a creative solution.

I'll give you two examples.

For example, you've got some room between the fence and that wall, just about a foot and a half, I think. Could you possibly put pilings on the other side of the wall and have the thing come over the wall. That's one

idea, okay. Remember, just enough to deter a car from going over. They are not going to be going 60 miles per hour.

The second thing is, you've got a berm between the wall and the driveway itself, right next to it. And I know it's not three feet away, okay. But you've got a berm that's probably a foot and a half, two feet.

Instead of putting it outside the berm, like you have it now in the picture, why not move it on to the berm? You don't lose any useable driveway space.

MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: I'm just confused as to where the berm is.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Could you put the picture up?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: The curb.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The curb.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: The asphalt curb.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The asphalt curb.

MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right there, instead of having an asphalt curb, why couldn't that be a -- It's not perfect, but it would still work. And save you a couple of feet, okay, into it.

As I said, I'm not the engineer here. I am not going to recommend anything. I'm just saying, I've got to

1	believe there is a creative solution to fixing this which
2	we would like to see you come back with by our next
3	meeting, if at all possible. Okay?
4	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Okay, Hugh?
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes. Go ahead, Johan.
6	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: I'm looking at the pictures
7	from Eliot.
8	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes.
9	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: The very first one, you
10	have the guardrail. You have the retaining wall that
11	doesn't sound like it's too strong. But just beyond that,
12	I see another guardrail. Is that Am I interpreting
13	this what you're
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: It looks like a guardrail,
15	yes.
16	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes.
17	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: So I'm curious if by
18	chance First of all, is that part of your property?
19	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Oh, got it.
20	MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: That's not. We don't
21	believe so. There is a current lawsuit about that guide
22	rail that other guardrail and the chain-linked fence,
23	among other things.
24	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Got it.
25	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Well, that guardrail

doesn't protect anything except for going into that fence. 1 BOARD MEMBER DESAI: It's not on their property. 2 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yeah. So I wouldn't do 3 But I think there may be a creative solution to 4 limit -- I don't like limiting the size of driveway access, 5 6 if at all, if it could be avoided. I do agree, however, that having a retaining wall 7 8 that somebody could easily go over it is not a good idea, for lots of reasons. You could skid over it. Somebody 9 could decide they are going to turn around all of a sudden 10 that they went the wrong way and go over it. Believe me, I 11 12 know because I have a big wall by my house that's been hit 13 a whole bunch of times. VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: And it's in the tightest 14 15 part of it. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right, exactly. So it's in the tightest part of the driveway. So that's what I 17 would do there. Anything else from the Board before I go 18 19 to the public? 20 MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Just one thing. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes, sir.

22

23

24

25

MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: I don't believe in that location where the quide rail is missing, I don't believe the elevation will change between our property and the neighbor's property is four to six feet. I think it's

1 something less than that.

I think the four to six feet is likely towards the playground in the background of that photo that's on the --

VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: That would be good to bring that information next time.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yeah. The building inspector -- Having you said that, okay, I have a driveway where people turn around. I'm at the end of a cul-- No, I wish it was a cul-de-sac, from me to God's ears. It's a dead end. So people try to turn around in my driveway, which is steep, okay.

The fact that they go off -- they have a tendency to go off of my driveway into my front yard. The fact that it's not six feet from my driveway into my front yard still has a car sitting in my front yard.

So the objective isn't just for it to be six feet, even if it's only a foot and a half. If you get a car caught on that -- You don't want to get car over that wall and caught there. That's the point.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Or on the other property.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Or on the other property.

Okay, even for their own people, you don't want to get a

car caught there. You want to keep them from doing that.

If they are going to go off, let them get their car into

1	some kind of guardrail. So there's a reason why that
2	guardrail makes sense.
3	I had the same question because I know as they
4	come forward, there is less of a slope. But there is still
5	the possibility of someone going off of that.
6	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Right. I'm happy
7	to coordinate a meeting with our building inspector's
8	office and the applicant to try to find a creative
9	solution, as you mentioned.
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you. Anybody
11	else from the Board?
12	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Amanda has a
13	question.
14	DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: So two things.
15	One, I think we talked about the drain inlet not being
16	shown, right?
17	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes, we did. So
18	that's going to be picked up in the as-built survey. It
19	was modified-another or a further field change. But I
20	discussed that with Mr. Dudley.
21	DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: Great.
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thanks.
23	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: The only other
24	thing I wanted to mention is that some additional
25	correspondence came in this afternoon from Mr. D'Adamo.

1	That was forwarded to the Planning Board, forwarded to the
2	applicant, and made part of the official record for the
3	project.
4	So I just wanted to state that on the record. I
5	came through via email late today for members that did not
6	see that.
7	DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: The other thing is
8	Town standard is 26 feet, not 24 feet wide. just to correc
9	that.
_0	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes. Thank you, Amanda.
.1	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: That's a roadway.
.2	Thank you for mentioning that.
.3	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right.
4	DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: Yes.
.5	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Because this is an
. 6	internal drive
.7	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right.
. 8	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: which is
9	different from a roadway. So that's why we have our
20	building inspector looking into it to make sure that it's
21	code compliant.
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right, okay. Any other
23	questions from the Board?
24	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
25	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. We're going to go

to the public comment now. And what I would do is write
whatever notes you want. And I'll give you an opportunity
to come back after we hear from the public. Okay?

MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Who first? Mr. Bodin.
Mr. Bodin. Let that gentleman go first. And then you,
Mr. Bodin, okay?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Can we have a full show of hands of those who intend to speak? Anyone else? Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Good.

MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Hello. My name is Danny D'Adamo. I'm the managing member of Greyrock Associates, LLC., the owner of 531 property. I would like to just mention that the inspector that approved the C of O was not the Robert Dam(ph) that was on the permit.

We all know that he was not with the Town for a number of weeks during that period. So someone else came to approve that C of O. So I just like to add that.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: It's all being reevaluated right now for them to get this approval. The building inspector is reviewing the whole application anyway so.

MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Oh. I'm here tonight to plead to this Board that they enforce the installation of

the missing guardrail on the 529 property for the safety of everyone.

As of tonight, there has been no known injuries. We are lucky that we had a very mild winter the last two years, with very little snow or ice storms. That will not be the case going forward. There will be injuries, a car will crash over to the 531 parking lot.

The 529 retaining wall was already hit on the driveway side. When an accident occurs and a car goes over into 531C property, questions will be asked, why wasn't the missing guardrail installed. I hope the answer won't be that we were trying to save -- preserve a couple of parking spots.

The clear solution is to have the 529 property owner install the missing guardrail and have them request additional parking variance. I believe to date there is 26.

What's the difference of one, two, three more parking variance. I hope the majority of you, after tonight, read what the missing guardrail that needs to be installed for the safety of everyone.

I don't know if the Board had time to review the letter and reports that were submitted today. If not, please delay any vote until you do. I am available.

Mr. Senor, my engineer, is available any time if you have

1	any questions. I would like to thank the Board for their
2	services.
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: As I said, we are holding
6	over the Public Hearing until we see the as-built plans and
7	address the issue anyway so.
8	MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: There will not be a vote
10	tonight.
11	MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Mr. Bodin.
13	MR. MURRAY BODIN: Could you put the diagram back
14	up that was
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Which one do you want?
16	MR. MURRAY BODIN: What?
17	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The general Site Plan?
18	MR. MURRAY BODIN: With the crosswalk, that
19	section.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Ghee, how did I
21	know it was the crosswalk.
22	MR. MURRAY BODIN: My name is Murray Bodin. My
23	qualifications are for over 30 years I was part of the team
24	that wrote and edited the Manual Uniform Traffic Control
25	Devices. I sat with the marketing committee for most of
	l .

1 that 30 years.

Plus, I, with two others, designed the dotted line auxillary that defines an auxillary lane. The dotted line did not exist before Scott Wainwright, Gene Hawkins and I designed it. So my experience with traffic control goes back quite a way.

We're in Greenburgh and we're talking about safety. That crosswalk at the bottom is not the safest crosswalk. The safest crosswalk is a parallel bar where the dotted lines are parallel to the direction of traffic.

You go into New York City, every crosswalk that's barred has lines parallel to the direction. It's the only -- all over the world, it's the only crosswalk that looks the same to the driver. Who has to recognize the crosswalk today? The driver.

When crosswalks were originated 75, 100 years ago, they had to teach people what a crosswalk was. So they designed various different ones. Today, everybody in the crosswalk, people are standing there. The driver in the car is going rapidly.

If you want to know how good New York State DOT is, it's enforcing the current manual. Walk outside, I'll stand at the curb and point out to you at least ten items that they break the law directly.

What do you do when you have 100,000, 500,000

traffic engineers that have been doing it wrong for 50 years and they don't want to admit they have been doing it wrong. You just install the HAWK beacon on Central Avenue, but you won't change the crosswalks.

Now, I am not going to be able to do this much longer. So what I've decided to do, each of you sitting on this Board and each of you in this room, look at the crosswalks as you go by and see if they are clear to you and why they are not one standard.

Because you and I know that people are not paying attention. They are texting. How do you know? The light turns green, nobody moves. Right? You've seen it. That's called distracted driving.

So when they look up, they have no idea what they see, except it should be clear; yellow on the left, white on the right. The manual says, we want the line to be wider for emphasis.

Do you really think that a distracted driver is going to notice the width of the line and then be able to process, this is a special line because it's wider and I should behave differently? You're dealing with mentalities that's been out there for 50 years.

I can't do it anymore. So I'm going around and deputizing, not only you, everybody back here.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Do we get little badges,

1	Murray?
2	MR. MURRAY BODIN: What?
3	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: We're being deputized,
4	right?
5	MR. MURRAY BODIN: Right.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I want a little badge for
7	myself.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: He'll bring one. Now you
9	started it.
0	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I was going to make one.
.1	MR. MURRAY BODIN: I have one, as a matter of
.2	fact. It says, we've always done it this way, with a slash
.3	through it. I should have brought it tonight.
. 4	BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: That's a good one.
.5	MR. MURRAY BODIN: You've all seen my card. I've
. 6	added a handicap symbol to it because I'm a handicap
_7	driver. I use an electric wheelchair a good deal of the
. 8	time.
9	There is no reason why that crosswalk can't be
20	integrated with the space between the handicap spaces
21	and
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: You're talking about the
23	buffer space?
24	MR. MURRAY BODIN: What?
25	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The buffer between the

1 handicap.

MR. MURRAY BODIN: Yeah, right. That's a crosswalk it's a zebra crosswalk painted blue. Why can't we share it. Nobody gets out of the car for a long time.

And people have been extremely nice to me. I used to help people all the time, you know, older people.

And I'm not used to people helping me because I'm an older person. It's really not easy to accept that. I want to do it myself, but I can't always do it.

So each of you needs to look. One of you, somebody somewhere is going to realize this is wrong. We want to save people in Greenburgh. Every crosswalk should look the same to the driver, not to the pedestrian.

Pedestrian is standing still. He's not going to use it anyhow, but that's beside the point.

Don't laugh. You're only encouraging me. You're encouraging me.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: No, I do it all the time.

MR. MURRAY BODIN: All right. I can't last much longer. I know it. I get weaker. I'm losing my ability to make sense of some things, but not this. Because it's too engrained. It's your job for your grandchildren and my grandchildren and my new great granddaughter --

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Congratulations.

MR. MURRAY BODIN: Thank you. It's your job to

1	make it safer for the next generation. It will save
2	accidents. It saves money. And it's going to make you
3	feel better. Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Thank you, Murray.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Mr. Bodin.
7	Anybody else want to discuss this?
8	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
9	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Does the applicant have
10	anything to respond to before we close tonight's meeting?
11	Adjourn I should say.
12	MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Not really, Mr. Chairman.
13	Some of the comments raised by Mr. D'Adamo are similar to
14	the ones raised by the Board. We will look to work with
15	Aaron's team and our engineers to see what possibilities,
16	if any, are available for placing a guide rail along the
17	remaining retaining wall there.
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I've heard two comments
19	about the crosswalk now. It's a matter of repainting.
20	Think about it, okay, as well, and respond to that, if you
21	don't mind, for the next meeting. All right?
22	MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Will do.
23	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Murry, until we get a

grant for a lot of money, I don't think we're changing every crosswalk in Greenburgh. But it's a great idea. It

24

25

1	really is a good idea. It's not going to happen. But we
2	should try to keep it, going forward, uniform, absolutely
3	right on that. I couldn't agree more.
4	Anything else, sir?
5	MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: No.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: In which case, I'll take a
7	motion to adjourn tonight's Hearing and hold it over to the
8	next meeting.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: So moved.
LO	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Second?
L1	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Second.
L2	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Kirit. All in favor?
L 3	Aye.
L4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Aye.
15	BOARD MEMBER SIMON: Aye.
16	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Aye.
L7	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Aye.
L8	BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: Aye.
9	ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Aye.
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: All oppose?
21	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I'll take a motion to
23	close the Public Hearing portion of our meeting tonight.
24	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Real quick. Next
25	meeting being Wednesday, July 17th.

1	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: July 17th. Do I have that
2	motion on the floor?
3	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: So moved.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Who was that, Johan?
5	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Can I have a second,
7	please?
8	ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Second.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Second. Aisha got me.
10	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Aisha got you. All in
11	favor? Aye.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Aye.
13	BOARD MEMBER SIMON: Aye.
14	BOARD MEMBER DESAI: Aye.
15	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Aye.
16	BOARD MEMBER DAVIS: Aye.
17	ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Aye.
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: All oppose?
19	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
20	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay.
21	MATHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Thank you.
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
23	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Thank you,
24	everybody.
25	(Whereupon, the Public Hearing was concluded.)

CERTIFICATION

Certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the Public Hearing of the Greenburgh Planning Board Meeting proceedings held on July 1, 2024, taken by the

undersigned, to the best of her ability.

Barbara Marciante

Barbara Marciante, Official Court Reporter