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

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

3 CASE NO. PB 20-09 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: We're going into Public 1 Hearing. Mr. Schmidt, please call the roll. 2 3 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Chairperson 4 Schwartz? 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Here. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Hay? 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Here. 8 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Golden? BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Here. 9 10 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. Snaggs? 11 BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Here. 12 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Ms. Sparks? 13 ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Present. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Note for the record 14 15 that Mr. Simon, Mr. Desai and Ms. Davis are not present 16 this evening for the Public Hearing. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you. And 18 again, for the record, I want to say that three physically 19 present Board Members here on the dais are also members of 20 Viable Living Incorporated as a result of the Resolution TB 21 One that was passed last week by the Town Board. The 22 status of those three people is questionable. That's it. 23 Let's go on. And our first case, actually our 24 only case tonight, is PB 20-09. It's a continuation of a 25 Hearing from the last time. And if you can announce

yourself and tell us what progress we've made. I will get it out sooner or later. What progress we've made, I would appreciate it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

And then we will hear from the questions here and then from the public. I think there may be some questions from the public as well tonight. Go ahead.

7 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Good evening, 8 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board and Town Staff, my name is Matthew Dudley, attorney from Harris Beach, PLLC., 9 10 Counsel for the applicant, 529 Central Park Avenue, LLC. 11 with respect to this continued Public Hearing for an 12 Amended Special Permit and Site Plan Approval for the 13 property located at 529 Central Park Avenue. That is the 14 location of Lightbridge Academy Daycare Center.

To remind the Board, the application seeks amendment of those approvals to allow for a maximum of 152 full-time equivalent students or children at that child daycare center. Currently, the applicant is capped per the prior approvals at 105 full-time equivalent children at that center.

In addition, we also seek an Amended Approval to remove, from the prior approvals of 2020, the condition that the first, I believe, it's three parking spaces in front of the building be designated for employee parking only.

As the Chairman noted, last time we appeared 1 before the Board at the July 1st meeting to present our 2 application, we also heard comment from the Board and the 3 public, two of those comments were: 4 First, that there should be consideration of 5 potential fall protection device for vehicles running along 6 the portion of a retaining wall that runs along the parking 7 8 lot where there currently is no fall protection device. And secondly, potential consideration of 9 reconfiguration of a crosswalk that runs -- that's striped 10 11 on the asphalt parking lot and driveway. And it runs from the end of the sidewalk that runs parallel to the driveway 12 13 up to the front area of the building. 14 Since then, our engineers have worked to submit 15 revised drawings and plans, to the Board addressing those 16 two comments. With me tonight, via Zoom, is Jesse Cokeley 17 of Colliers Engineering. He's the project engineer for 18 this application. 19 In addition, Michelle Briehof from Colliers is 20 the project's traffic engineer. And she's available to answer any questions that you may have regarding the 21 22 updated traffic study that was provided as part of this 23 application. 24

I will let Jesse Cokeley explain in more detail the revisions that were made to the plans since our last

25

meeting. Just briefly, we now propose installing bollards along the retaining wall where there currently is no fall protection device.

4

5

6

7

8

24

25

And also, we have reconfigured the striping of the crosswalk so that it does not end abruptly in the back of a parking space, but rather guides any pedestrians towards the unloading area for the handicap parking spaces in front of the building.

Just additionally, a couple days ago, the
Building Department issued, it was on July 15th, issued an
updated Memorandum based on its review of the revised plans
here finding that no further area variances are required
for this revised application.

Currently, we're scheduled to be on the Zoning Board's agenda for tomorrow tonight's meeting. The application for the amended area variance for the off-street parking spaces, it's closed for decision for tomorrow night.

Additionally, the Building Department, in its memo, noted that the first three spaces in the parking lot on the project should be -- there should be signage for compact cars only. We discussed that with our client and he's amenable and fine with doing that.

Lastly, per communication with Mr. Schmidt's office, we have learned that the Building Department no

	7 CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	longer is requiring as-built survey for the property at
2	this time.
3	However, should this Board grant the approvals
4	that we seek and we do install the bollards and crosswalk,
5	following that construction, the Building Department would
6	require an as-built survey at that time.
7	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: All right. It's my
8	understanding that the plans that we have before us now
9	include the bollards are as-built, yes?
10	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Yes. Jesse
11	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Isn't that the site plan?
12	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: The site plan.
13	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The site plan, okay.
14	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Jesse, can you specify
15	that?
16	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Sure. I'm going to share my
17	screen. Can everyone hear me okay?
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes.
19	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Just your name and
20	association with the project for the record.
21	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Sure. So Jesse Cokeley with
22	Colliers Engineering and Design, the engineer of record for
23	this Site Plan application. Everyone can see that I'm
24	sharing the screen now?
25	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Can you blow it up a

	8 CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	little bit, Jesse? We'd appreciate it.
2	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Sure thing. Can you see my
3	screen now, the site plan before you?
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes. Just blow it up a
5	little bit.
6	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Will do. I'm going to zoom
7	into the two areas in question. So the plan has been
8	updated with the location of the retaining wall that was
9	constructed as well as the guide rail that was constructed.
10	Similarly, you may recall, as part of the
11	Approved Site Plan, we installed bollards at the north end
12	of the parking lot to provide protection from the
13	playground that was constructed.
14	So what we are proposing, at this point, is to
15	install 15 bollards in front of the wall at spacing about
16	five feet on center. They would be four feet high, just
17	like the ones that were installed and approved, again, on
18	the north end of the parking lot up here. And they would
19	be set at a distance to provide the 14-foot minimum
20	separation or a drive aisle, if you will.
21	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: 24-foot minimum.
22	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Yeah, 24-foot, excuse me.
23	And so those bollards, the 15, extend around the corner and
24	come down, you know, a portion of the driveway as well.
25	The driveway is much wider itself.

Г

The other change, as Mr. Dudley indicated, at the 1 request of the Board and the public, was to modify the 2 painted crosswalk. We have a couple of options here. But 3 we are -- we hit into a similar constraint with the drive 4 5 aisle in this location. Right now, you can see the dimension, I'll zoom 6 7 in a little bit more, from the edge of the spaces and near 8 the wall that was constructed, it's about 26 and a half feet to the existing rock wall that's out there, if you're 9 10 familiar. It's like a curve and then it's a very steep, 11 like rock wall that's like, you know, almost like a natural 12 retaining wall. 13 If we were to continue the sidewalk all the way 14 up and go 90 degrees across, we would then eliminate or we would be less than the 24-foot minimum requirement for 15 16 two-way circulation. 17 So what we did was, we kind of angled the 18 crosswalk a little bit more and extended it so that the 19 pedestrians leaving the sidewalk would be able to take the 20 crosswalk and enter through the kind of a loading aisle with a straight aisle next to the ADA space. 21 22 So those are the two changes. I think the 23 Building Inspector's revised memo indicates that, you know, 24 the bollards themselves would, obviously, need a building 25 permit and then an as-built would be submitted upon

10 CASE NO. PB 20-09 completion of that work as well. 1 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Couple of things. 2 3 Do you --MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: I just have a few more 4 5 comments. CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Absolutely. Go right 6 7 ahead. 8 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Unless you have a 9 question. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: No, no. It's fine, I'll 11 wait. MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Okay. I just wanted 12 13 to also mention that today we received two comment letters; 14 one from the neighbor, Mr. D'Adamo, and one from his 15 engineer, Mr. Senor. I will let Mr. Cokeley respond in more detail to the comments within those letters. 16 17 However, I just note that it seemed as though the 18 bulk of the comments were related to the retaining wall 19 that was approved or our client applied for it in 2022. It 20 was -- a building permit was issued for that retaining wall. It was built. And as I stated at the last Planning 21 22 Board meeting, the CO was issued for that retaining wall. 23 And I just want to provide just a procedural 24 context of why that retaining wall was constructed in the first place. In 2022 -- 2020, I'm sorry, Mr. D'Adamo filed 25

a lawsuit against both our client and the Town related to various issues, property issues, between these two properties.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

25

At the last meeting, I mentioned that one of those issues was the apparent trespass on to his property of the location of the chain-linked fence and the guide rail that is currently on his side of the retaining wall.

Another one of the issues was a claim that there was erosion or a slump of earth embankment from our client's property on to Mr. D'Adamo's property.

And so without conceding any truth of that allegation, our client applied to the Town in 2022 in an effort to mitigate against any potential future erosion of the embankment since our property is at a higher elevation than Mr. D'Adamo's. It was an effort to help the situation if it did, in the future, prove that there was erosion from his property.

Respectfully, we don't believe that the issue of the retaining wall is currently before your Board as part of this Amended Site Plan Approval. It was fully approved by the Building Department in 2022. And again, there is the CO issued for that retaining wall.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Aaron, you wantedto say something?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes. I would like

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

24

25

Mr. Cokeley to address the comment in one of the two memos related to the drain that had been previously shown on the site plan adjacent to where both the three currently employee parking spaces -- Yeah, I see the cursor. And where the bollards are shown to be installed now. That was a comment that was raised and I would like that addressed. Thank you.

8 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Sure. Mr. Cokeley? MR. JESSE COKELEY: Absolutely. So to add a 9 10 little bit more to Mr. Dudley's statement there about when 11 the retaining wall was extended, in 2022, we had filed an 12 amended plan to the Town to basically address the issue, as 13 he said, with where the guide rail or chain-link fence was or wasn't on his property, what we were modifying or what 14 15 we were not.

Instead, we wanted to install a retaining wall solely on our property, leave whatever was in question or on the property line, over whatever, not touch it, and just proceed.

As part of the original site plan, the reason why we didn't need a retaining wall is, if you recall the old site, it was very steep. This parking lot was very steep from the existing sidewalk to the property.

We wanted to raise this area, flatten it out because, obviously, the goal and the use of this is to have

parents and children. So we wanted it flatter, safer, easier to access for everybody.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

So we raised the grade here. And as part of the original plan, we were going to put a catch basin kind of at the corner here. And that was put there also as a means to help, at the time, the underdrain that we had kind of running along this part of the property line, along the face of the wall and also to account for the storm water that was coming down from the back of the property.

10 So that was there to also help catch that 11 underground drain and help it make a 90-degree turn or an 12 angled turn to the other proposed catch basin, which is at 13 the low point before. This is the low point, and also 14 after construction we maintained that low point.

There is a drain line that runs along the southern property line here. And when we filed that amended plan, we showed the catch basin here just because we were extending the wall, we extended the pipe. We kind of moved it out a little bit.

As construction occurred, we made a slight modification to that, which was submitted on the Storm Water Record Plan to the Town to close out the storm water permit. But we ended up just slightly moving that catch basin back here, about to where this nine-foot typical dimension is.

And we used it to also collect some of the roof leaders and one of the drains from the playground and brought it straight into the existing drain line that runs on the south side of the property.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

There is still an underdrain that comes down parallel to the wall, makes the turn and connects into that drain as well. So we're still providing the drainage that would be required behind the wall. That still helps us collect and pick up the drainage that's coming from the north part of the site.

And then we have a second one with the inlet to help capture some of the parking lot flow, and I mentioned the roof leaders and the playground as well. So we still are maintaining the intent of the original approval.

15 It was just a slight shift of the catch basin, 16 you know, because now we were squaring off the wall, making 17 some changes. It was going to be too tight to put that 18 catch basin back in that spot.

The storm water, based on the grading that was there before and is there now, directs the water that is not captured by the inlet, but, which is a relatively small area, makes the turn, comes down the drain, and goes into this catch basin, as it did before.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Question, Tom.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Okay. You mentioned the

	15
	CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	catch basin over where the nine-foot typical label is, but
2	I don't see one.
3	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Correct. So this is just
4	a We just modified this plan. And that catch basin will
5	be shown on the as-built that we submitted once
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: But earlier, it said that
7	the as-built, that we're looking at the as-built, and it
8	was just going to be confirmed later.
9	MR. JESSE COKELEY: No, no
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: So, in fact, this doesn't
11	have everything that's there now.
12	MR. JESSE COKELEY: No, this is not an as-built.
13	This is a site plan.
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Well, I know. But even in
15	the site plan, we approve the site plan that is what the
16	Building Department will compare to the final survey, okay.
17	So whatever we approve, if we approve it without that
18	drainage on there, technically, you wouldn't You have an
19	approval without that drainage from the Planning Board.
20	That's not going to happen.
21	DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: So the site plan
22	needs to show existing conditions plus any proposed
23	conditions. The Planning Board shouldn't really proceed
24	until we have that.
25	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: That's right, thank you.

Yup. So you have time to do it because you're only seeing 1 the Zoning Board tomorrow night anyway. And they are 2 probably not going to make a decision on the same night. 3 So you still have time to do that. 4 5 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Their scheduled to issue a decision, but we need to wait --6 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, well, we can't give 8 a decision until after the Zoning Board grants the 9 variances anyway. So you have until, we're meeting on 10 August 7th, at a minimum, to bring that up, to look 11 as-built. 12 That's what we're looking for and that's what 13 we've been asking for, okay. It shouldn't be that 14 difficult to do. It's not that complicated. 15 MR. JESSE COKELEY: I totally agree. The 16 surveyor is, I think, scheduled to be out there next week 17 to perform the as-built so we can have --18 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: No, no. Just let me make 19 it clear, because I know what the Building Inspector said. 20 He's not necessarily looking for the survey. We're looking for the site plan. We don't look at the survey. We're 21 22 looking for a site plan that has the existing, right --23 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: Right. All the 24 existing conditions and proposed conditions. So --25 MR. JESSE COKELEY: Right. But the existing

17 CASE NO. PB 20-09 conditions would be picked up by the survey. So that's 1 what we need is --2 3 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: So that's your 4 choice --5 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Just put it on the site That's all we're asking you to do. The site plan 6 plan. 7 has to match that survey, okay --8 MR. JESSE COKELEY: Sure. CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: -- before we can make a 9 10 decision. That's what our Counsel is telling you. Okay? MR. JESSE COKELEY: Understood. Understood. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you. I do 13 have another question, though. It was one that, I think, 14 was brought up by Mr. Senor. I know, I believe there was a 15 concern -- and Mr. Senor can come up if I screw it up, 16 which I might, I bet I might -- that you're building those 17 bollards on top of the drainpipe. And is there enough room 18 to do that? I think that was the question, I believe. 19 Pretty much? 20 MR. ELIOT SENOR: That's correct. CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. You have to come up 21 22 to the mic then. I just want to -- why don't you come up because I think that's an issue that needs to be clarified. 23 24 Thank you. 25 MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yeah, hi, Eliot Senor,

engineer, here for the neighbor. Yes, during construction, 1 they uncovered several pipes in that area. And the 2 pictures I submitted, one of them is almost directly behind 3 the retaining wall as it was being constructed. So if they 4 5 are putting those bollards in that area, are they going to be, you know, problematic to that pipe? 6 7 The pipe goes along the entrance area and then 8 perpendicular or in a perpendicular direction. And so I just want to say, we're only here for safety issues, you 9 10 know. We're not necessarily opposed to the project. But 11 we are an adjacent property. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I just ask that -- the 13 only question I want answered right now, Eliot, is that, 14 okay --15 MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yup. 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: -- because the Planning 17 Board has their time to ask some questions and then you can 18 come up and speak again, okay. Amanda? 19 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: So a point and a 20 question. The question being, has Engineering reviewed the changes to the storm water on the plans, including removal 21 of some of those drains? 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: And the bollards. 23 24 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: And the bollards. 25 And if not, I suggest that you reach out to Engineering and

19 CASE NO. PB 20-09 get an answer on that before the next meeting. 1 2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Right. So we just 3 want to be sure that the Storm Water Management Control Permit previously issued is based off existing conditions 4 5 at the site now that are going to be picked up on this plan and that there is final sign-off and review complete by the 6 7 Bureau of Engineering. 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Well, there's a little bit Amanda said something that should -- I don't want to 9 more. 10 lose what you say because I think it's extremely important. 11 We want to make sure from Engineering that it's 12 accurate that the placement of the bollards, as shown on 13 the site plan, do not disturb the drainage system, okay. 14 That's a very important question to ask. And it needs to 15 be confirmed by our Engineering Department, okay. 16 That's -- right, are we good with that? 17 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: That's right. 18 Understood. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Is that clear? 20 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Understood, yes. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Are there any other 22 questions from the Board at this point? 23 (Whereupon, there was no response.) 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Any other comments 25 from the public? Murray, why don't you go first and then I

20 CASE NO. PB 20-09 1 will let Mr. Senor go. MR. MURRAY BODIN: I'm still Murray Bodin, for 2 3 how much longer, I don't know. Greenburgh is particularly interested in the safety of pedestrians. I brought up the 4 5 crosswalk issue and they have begun to address it. The parallel bars are correct, except their orientation is not 6 7 correct. 8 When a driver looks out, he needs to see the same parallel bars parallel to the direction of the traffic, not 9 10 Those are bars, but they are in the wrong direction. that. 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Murray, what do you do, 12 though, when it's at a corner like that? 13 MR. MURRAY BODIN: You put them parallel to the 14 center line. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: No. No. I'm saying, if 16 you do them on a corner, I'm just asking you a question, 17 okay. 18 MR. MURRAY BODIN: Go ahead. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Just for clarification. 20 It's on a corner. So right now, which is great, from what 21 you -- let me finish. Let me ask the question. Then I 22 will let you answer it. I promise you. I promise you. 23 It's right now, you get your parallel bars in 24 either direction because of the angle they put it on. They 25 put it on about a 40 -- give or take, a 45-degree angle,

21 CASE NO. PB 20-09 maybe a little bit less. The question I have, though, what 1 happens, if you straighten it out, one way they are not 2 3 going to be parallel anymore. VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Parallel? 4 5 MR. MURRAY BODIN: You don't --CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I flunked geometry, so 6 7 tell me where I'm wrong. 8 MR. MURRAY BODIN: The angle of the crosswalk 9 makes no difference. It can be anywhere. The angle, where 10 it is is in a correct position, more or less. But the bars 11 are not. The bars need to be parallel to the center line. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: So are you saying the bars 13 should be like this? 14 MR. MURRAY BODIN: Like that, right. Exactly. 15 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Let me see. 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: So the bars are like this. 17 MR. MURRAY BODIN: Right. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: But then you're not 19 getting --20 MR. MURRAY BODIN: So when they look -- When the driver looks at it, he sees a series of parallel bars 21 22 everywhere the driver goes. Traffic engineers have been 23 doing it wrong for 50 years. How do you tell a traffic 24 engineer he's been making the same mistake for 50 years? 25 They don't want to hear it.

My position today is, if they can't understand 1 the world we live in today, if you look at television, the 2 3 rest of the world, they are all bars this way. They could be on an angle, but the bars are always parallel to the 4 5 center line. And my direction -- request is, if these engineers can't figure that out, fire them and get new 6 7 ones. 8 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Not my engineers, Murray. MR. MURRAY BODIN: What? 9 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: They are not my engineers. 11 I don't hire them. 12 MR. MURRAY BODIN: The book was written 50 years 13 ago for a different world. Today, the driver needs to see the crosswalk, the pedestrian is standing still. That has 14 15 to be recognized. And I'm prepared to challenge any 16 engineer in person to show that that crosswalk, where it 17 should be. 18 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. 19 MR. MURRAY BODIN: Janno Lieber said, the best 20 way to do business is face to face. The Zoom doesn't do 21 the trick. And Greenburgh has refused to meet with me in 22 person. And I challenge that. 23 If you want safety, you meet back to the office 24 right across -- just like we're doing here. The reason I 25 come to these meetings, because there's an interaction

23 CASE NO. PB 20-09 between us. I can see the expression on your faces. You 1 can see what I'm doing. It has to change. 2 The second thing is, the crosswalk and the space 3 4 where the handicap is needs to be integrated and called a 5 pedestrian way, a shared area, and that hasn't been done. When you come out of the handicap spaces, I'm in 6 7 a wheelchair and I got my electric wheelchair, I'm lost. 8 There is no way for me to get safely to a building. And that new kind of thinking, because more and more people are 9 10 using walkers, wheelchairs and need that safety. 11 You're beginning to look at the change in 12 thinking of all roads in the United States. It's time. 13 They have been breaking the law and there has been no 14 enforcement of it. 15 This is about the people who enforce the law as 16 currently written. And they don't do it, fire them and 17 hire somebody new, who is prepared to obey the law as 18 currently written. 19 I stopped talking about what I thought should be 20 there in the book. What's in the book now is adequate. All you have to do is enforce it. And if the Chair and the 21 22 Commissioners or whatever department can't enforce the law, 23 fire them and get new ones. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Well --25 MR. MURRAY BODIN: No, I'm sorry.

	24
	CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Wait.
2	MR. MURRAY BODIN: I'm sorry, Hugh. It's my
З	time.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay.
5	MR. MURRAY BODIN: And you want to speak after I
6	do, fine. But I will not be interrupted while I am
7	speaking.
8	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I apologize, Mr. Bodin.
9	Please finish.
10	MR. MURRAY BODIN: See, this is new. People have
11	been cutting me off and everything else. The Board meeting
12	on Monday, the first speaker was there for three minutes
13	and then continued for another three minutes.
14	When it got to me, they tried to stop me. I
15	turned around to the Chairman and I said, you set the
16	rules. The rule was if the speaker was speaking and you
17	wanted to
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: If you want to
19	MR. MURRAY BODIN: I'm sorry, Hugh, don't
20	interrupt me.
21	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Murray, I was just
22	DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: It must be relevant
23	to the current Public Hearing that's before us, please.
24	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right. It's a Public
25	Hearing only on

	25 CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	MR. MURRAY BODIN: But he's interrupting me.
2	DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: It's not relevant
3	to the current Public Hearing, though. So save it for
4	public comment time.
5	MR. MURRAY BODIN: I would like them to revise
6	the crosswalk to use parallel bars, parallel to the
7	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: You said that. Appreciate
8	it.
9	MR. MURRAY BODIN: I apologize for being nasty,
10	but the only way things get done is with nastiness. I may
11	not be here much longer. I'm going to be as nasty as I can
12	be just for the safety of the people in Greenburgh. I'm
13	tired of being shut up.
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Mr. Bodin.
15	Mr. Senor, did you want to come up and make
16	comments?
17	MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yeah. I mean that's just a
18	drafting change to make the lines parallel. It makes sense
19	to me. So I'm one of engineers that may agree with you.
20	So basically, we're only concerned about safety.
21	We're concerned that because our property is the lower
22	property, right.
23	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: On that map, which is your
24	property?
25	MR. ELIOT SENOR: The property where that cursor

26 CASE NO. PB 20-09 is now. 1 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: South? 2 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Next to the retaining 4 wall, Michael. 5 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Okay, okay. MR. ELIOT SENOR: Right? The front property. 6 7 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: So just below it in 8 elevation? 9 MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yes. And so we're concerned, 10 you know, about cars going over that wall. Cars, you 11 know -- the wall failing and causing problems. 12 So, of course, I know that the current conditions 13 also requires topo in elevations. So I just want to make 14 sure that when they submit the current conditions or the site plan, that it has elevations on it as well. Make sure 15 16 they are aware of that. 17 So as we said, we're the lower area. Now, yes, 18 there is a suit that has to do with placement of fill on my 19 client's property. So the builder, to minimize the height 20 of the wall, placed several feet of fill on my client's property. And there is a suit about removing that 21 22 trespass, that fill as a trespass. 23 Now, when that fill is removed, that wall goes 24 three or four feet taller, which then has, you know, its 25 own problems. So our whole problem with it is the location

27 CASE NO. PB 20-09 of the bollards, the strength of the bollards, a Unilock 1 wall, a segmental retaining wall had no lateral resistance. 2 3 You can push it over. 4 The reason how it works is the geogrid behind it 5 holds the soil in place and the block is just to stop the soil from eroding away. So having the bollards there, not 6 7 installed properly, if they go down deep enough, it's all 8 just a resistance against nothing. So that is our contention. We're worried about 9 10 the safety of our property because if we have a parking lot 11 below it and somebody is standing there and a car goes over 12 the top, you know, it's whose liability is it, you know, 13 the accident happens on our property. 14 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: I have a question. I mean, 15 this daycare center has been in operation for a few years 16 already, right? 17 MR. ELIOT SENOR: No, no, just months. 18 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: That's not true. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Over a year, right? 20 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: That's not true. The original approvals were in 2020. So I think it's been in 21 22 operation more than two years, I believe. 23 MR. ELIOT SENOR: When was the C of O granted? 24 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: I'm not sure. Jesse, 25 do you have that?

28 CASE NO. PB 20-09 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: It's been 1 approximately two years. 2 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: All right. So --3 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: It's more than a few 4 5 months, let's put it that way. BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: It's definitely more than a 6 7 few months. So assuming it's been in operation for two 8 years, have there been any incidents or accidents or near misses during the past two years? 9 MR. ELIOT SENOR: Yes. We originally showed, the 10 11 last submission we showed a picture of some dislodged blocks on the wall. 12 13 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: No, no. I mean safety. 14 Forget the erosion. MR. ELIOT SENOR: No, that -- No, somebody -- We 15 16 believe, we don't have an eyewitness, but some of the 17 blocks on the top of the wall were dislodged. We believe 18 it's because a car hit it. We weren't there to witness it 19 so I can't say. 20 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Okay, okay. 21 MR. ELIOT SENOR: All right. So that's basically 22 what we're worried about. The as-built, of course, is a 23 big thing. They are showing that retaining wall is may be 24 12-inches wide, a segmental wall has a batter to it. So as 25 you go up, it moves back.

So even though the top may be six inches wide, 1 from the bottom to the back of the top is more than a foot. 2 3 And so if the bottom is a foot off of the property line, the top may be two feet off the property line. So without 4 5 having an as-built, we don't really know where that wall was built. So, I mean, that's our position. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Appreciate that, 8 Mr. Senor. Any other questions from the Board? And I have 9 a couple of comments. Anybody else from the public? 10 Murray, only once right now, okay. We have another person 11 back there. 12 Please state your name when you come up. 13 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Hi, my name is Danny D'Adamo. 14 I'm the managing member of Greyrock Associates who owns the 15 property at 531 Central Park Avenue. I just want to bring 16 up several things and a couple --17 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: If it's the same -- I read 18 your -- We got your letter late this afternoon. But I did 19 have a chance to read it. A lot of the stuff is parallel 20 to what Mr. Senor has said. If that's what you're going to 21 testify, in the interest of moving ahead, just say you 22 agree. 23 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: I just want to, if you can 24 blow that up. 25 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Mr. D'Adamo, you

30 CASE NO. PB 20-09 could use the --1 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Wait, wait. Which one do 2 3 you want blown up? 4 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: The one that's right there. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: All the way up. You see the 6 7 two bollards closest to the curb? 8 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: At the turn? MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: At the turn. 9 10 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Okay. CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yeah. 11 12 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: So it appears that the 13 quardrail is two feet off the wall. The bollards are 14 two feet off the wall. Then when it gets closer to the 15 turn, it's almost zero. What was the reasoning for that? 16 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: We will ask the 17 applicant to address that. 18 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: If they deem that it needs to 19 be two feet away for it to have some strength, how do you 20 go to zero? So I would like the people point out to that. 21 When I picked it up and I said I don't understand, if these 22 need to be two-foot, why did they go to zero? 23 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: We will ask them to 24 address that. 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: We will ask them to

31 CASE NO. PB 20-09 respond to that. 1 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: And I think it's because you 2 3 want to save three parking spots. CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: We will ask them the 4 5 question. Or they'll answer the question, I'm sure. MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: I just want to give you a 6 7 brief what's going on. At the last meeting, Chairman, you 8 indicated the 529 representative that we should clean this up. And you're correct. This should get cleaned up. 9 This 10 is all about safety. 11 That chain-linked fence has been damaged severely 12 and it's hanging and it's going to be removed. The old 13 guardrail is going to be removed. All that dirt is going 14 to be removed. So what you're looking at is a gigantic drop off. So I think we need to keep that in mind when 15 16 we're talking about --17 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Let me just clarify that, 18 though. You're saying it's going to be removed depending 19 on what happens in Court? 20 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Correct. CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: That's a totally different 21 22 issue. Correct me if I'm wrong on this, Ms. Magana, what 23 we're approving tonight has nothing to do with the Court. 24 We have nothing to do with the Court. 25 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Well, so --

32 CASE NO. PB 20-09 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Let me finish. What will 1 happen, if the Court requires modifications be on the site 2 plan, then you have to come back to us with an amended site 3 4 plan. Right? 5 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Yes. 6 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Potentially. 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Potentially, yeah. 8 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Certain things can be handled administratively. 9 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: But for example, if you're 10 11 exposing three feet more of the wall or something like that 12 or something like that, I would assume they are going to 13 have to come back, at a minimum, to the Building Inspector 14 and possibly to us for a revised site plan; is that 15 correct? 16 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: Yes, that is 17 correct. 18 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: But I think that the 19 important thing is the fact that there is a Court 20 proceeding, the fact that there may be a lawsuit pending 21 right now is irrelevant. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: That's correct. 23 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Absolutely irrelevant. And 24 frankly, we don't want to hear about it. Because it's not 25 going to affect our decision one way or the other.

33 CASE NO. PB 20-09 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: I understand. 1 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Let him -- You can finish. 2 And then we should have the applicant respond. 3 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: I just want to know when you 4 5 make this decision, don't feel obligated to the 529 owner because this was previously approved, this or that. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: You know what, we never 8 feel --9 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: I just wanted to highlight. 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: -- obligated to you or 11 anyone else. What we do is, we're obligated to the law. 12 That's all we're obligated to. Okay, we don't take sides. 13 We do what we believe complies with the law. And 14 anybody who says otherwise should go to another Town 15 because we are very, very strong in doing that. 16 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: I appreciate that. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Is that clear? 18 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Yes, sir. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Good. I find that 20 insulting to even question that. MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: I just also want to add that 21 22 as being a neighbor, I made several attempts to contact the 23 previous owner. On day one --24 VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Previous owner? 25 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: No, the current owner, I'm

1 sorry.

2

3

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Previous owner was the Town.

4 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: Current owner. We reached
5 out to them to say, let's get together and resolve this.
6 And the response was -- the response was, it's too early
7 for discussions.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Well, right now, back to 9 Mr. Golden's point, okay, right now, it is what it is, 10 okay. You're here to try to get this Amended Site Plan. 11 We'd would love to get through this and, hopefully, we can 12 in a way that fits everybody and makes people happy and we 13 have a safe site plan to do.

At the same time, you're in Court, that's a separate issue from this, that we have nothing to do with, okay. I can't help it that you guys aren't buddy-buddy, that's not -- We're really not in the match-making business. We encourage people to try to work together and settle their differences, absolutely. But beyond that, that's all we can do, okay.

That's all I'm saying, okay. So just, again, if there's anything else specific to the site plan that you want to add or comment on now that hasn't been commented on yet, absolutely you can do that. But keep it to that, please.

35 CASE NO. PB 20-09 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: One other comment I would 1 like to make. 2 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes. 4 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: The original plan had the 5 wall at the turn as a 90-degree angle. It is now as a curve. Why was it deviated from the original plan and they 6 7 made it a curve? 8 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: We will let them address that. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The applicant will address 11 that, okay. 12 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: And the last thing is, those 13 bollards that are close to the curve, the curve is an asphalt curve. It now serves as the means to divert the 14 15 water to the drain in the driveway. 16 If we put the bollards right in front of the 17 curb, it's going to block the natural flow of water and 18 it's going to bubble there and come over the wall. 19 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. 20 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: That's all I have to say. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thank you very much. 22 MR. DANNY D'ADAMO: As I always say, I appreciate 23 the service of you guys. Thank you. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you very much. 25 And thank you for your comments. I appreciate that.

36 CASE NO. PB 20-09 Aisha, you had a question? 1 ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Yes, quick 2 3 question. I think it might be easy. I recall the compact spaces there, the three, right, and you recently mentioned 4 5 limiting those spaces to compact cars. MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Yes. 6 7 ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: So I just wanted 8 to know the context around that. Was it a safety? But I 9 mean, obviously, the spaces are smaller. But just curious 10 about the key details, why they want to now restrict it 11 only to compact? DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: I can --12 13 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Please, Mr. Chair. 14 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: I'm happy to speak 15 to that. Because that was identified in an outline, I 16 should say, within the Building Inspector's most recent 17 memo. 18 The reason for that is there is a drive aisle 19 width that needs to be adhered to. And they show that as 20 varies, you know, 24-foot minimum. They need to ensure that there is a minimum of 24 feet. 21 22 So in doing so, and as the Building Inspector's 23 memo indicates, they have to, in order to meet that 24 24 feet, they need to identify those spaces and restrict 25 them to compact vehicle parking only. Because a standard

37 CASE NO. PB 20-09 space can be longer --1 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: And it's from --2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: -- and would 3 encroach into that drive aisle. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right. It's from the end of that parking space, correct. That's why. 6 7 ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: So then in the 8 traffic plan, we did not identify that any other type of 9 vehicles were parking in those spaces, those compact 10 spaces? 11 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: So previously --12 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay --13 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Sorry. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Go ahead. 15 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Prior to the 16 applicant and probably even today because they are 17 identified as employee parking spaces today. They are not 18 identified as compact parking spaces. I'm sure any vehicle 19 is parking there. 20 But those bollards aren't there today. So with 21 the installation of the bollards, they lose some width. 22 They are making it up by restricting those three spaces to 23 compact. Does that --24 ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Yes. 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Let me ask -- Let me ask a

38 CASE NO. PB 20-09 Zoning question. Maybe you know the answer to this. How 1 do you handle the compact spaces when you're counting 2 spaces from the Zoning point of view, they're counted as 3 full spaces? 4 5 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: Yes, full spaces. CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. I just wanted to 6 7 make sure. You want to answer the other questions that you 8 got from the public, from Mr. Senor? MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Sure. Many of the 9 10 comments, being engineering questions, if I can just turn 11 it over to Mr. Cokeley to respond to. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Sure. Certainly. 13 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: That's fine. 14 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Mr. Cokeley? 15 MR. JESSE COKELEY: Yeah. So basically, some of 16 the discussion you were just having and some of the 17 reasoning, we're trying to maintain that 24 feet, which is 18 the typical minimum requirement. 19 And I also believe the Town wanted for 90-degree 20 spaces, it's what you -- for a two-way traffic. So because 21 we have vehicles coming in -- going in to fit the space in 22 this parking area and vehicles going out. 23 Which, again, I think the Board saw very cleanly 24 in the time-lapse video that was submitted, and, you know, to the Board's comment here, like they're being used right 25

now by also parents dropping off their kids. But they pull out of the full-size spaces now. I think they are striped that way now. Back out, pull out, cars coming in, pull in, no issues.

5

6

7

8

9

But to Aaron's point, you know, we want to install the bollards. We want to maintain that 24 feet. And the Building Inspector's memo identified that we should designate these officially compact spaces and cut the striping back. So that's what we're showing here.

And what we will do is with the -- once the -excuse me, surveyor is out there to get the rest of the existing information, this site plan will be updated with that and resubmitted to the Board. And we will also bring it to the Engineering Department for storm water compliance as well.

16 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Jesse, if you could 17 just respond to the public comments regarding the 18 re-striping of the crosswalk to be parallel with the center 19 line?

20 MR. JESSE COKELEY: That is not something that I, 21 you know, I'm not a traffic engineer. Most crosswalks are 22 usually perpendicular to the pedestrian path of travel for 23 pedestrians. The vehicles traveling this portion of the 24 site are going to be vehicles that are very familiar with 25 this site. Most of the employees park in the rear of the

1 building.

You don't have necessarily visitors coming to use 2 the building. So everyone is going to be very familiar 3 with this. I think this is the safest for pedestrians and 4 5 the cleanest path of travel for pedestrians. Most of the traffic, as you saw, even in the 6 7 video, are parents coming, picking up and dropping off in 8 these front spaces. You know, a few handicap spaces, obviously, get used when needed. But most of the vehicles 9 10 in the back are the teachers that are coming to park, you know, for the day. 11 12 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Let me make a suggestion. 13 Speak to Murray, you know, after you're done. He will give 14 you the citations to the crosswalk standards. He will show you where to look. You can do your research --15 16 MR. JESSE COKELEY: Yeah --17 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Do your research after the 18 meeting --19 MR. JESSE COKELEY: I don't --BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Excuse me. Do your 20 research after the meeting. And then, you know, if you 21 22 feel a change is warranted, you can revise the plan. 23 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: We can certainly do 24 that. 25 MR. JESSE COKELEY: We will certainly do that. Ι

41 CASE NO. PB 20-09 don't have a problem changing it. 1 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Why don't we move on to 2 some of the other subjects that you've gotten, please. 3 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Sure. Just briefly, 4 5 with respect to the comment that there's been accidents on the site, we did request, there was a FOIL request to the 6 7 Greenburgh Police Department asking for any incidents that 8 may have been restricted to the intersection of the driveway and the roadway. But there was no incidents. 9 10 What Mr. Senor is referring to is some slightly 11 adjusted blocks on the retaining wall, I believe, running 12 along the drive aisle rather than a portion of the 13 retaining wall that runs along the parking area space. 14 Jesse, if you could just respond to the public comments about --15 16 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Wait. I just want to make 17 one comment. With all due respect, you can't just rely on 18 the police report in those kind of situations. The police 19 can only report on the ones that are reported. 20 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Sure. 21 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I can't tell you how many 22 times my stonewall has gotten hit that the police don't 23 have a report from. So that's all. 24 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ .: You're right. You're 25 right, Mr. Chairman. I should add that --

	42
	CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: You don't know if it did
2	or it didn't.
3	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: our client has
4	expressed to me that he's not aware of any accidents on his
5	site.
6	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right. You don't know
7	that for sure. Appreciate it, but it's, you know.
8	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Jesse, could you
9	please respond to the comment regarding the spacing between
10	the bollards and the retaining wall and as you get closer
11	to the corner of the retaining wall, the bollards appear to
12	get closer to the retaining wall?
13	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Yeah. I kind of addressed
14	that before. But it's to maintain the 24-foot minimum
15	drive aisle there. We did space them so that they're, you
16	know, narrower than any vehicle. They are taller than a
17	guide rail.
18	So they are visible when, you know, backing out,
19	you can see the bollards as well. So they are closer here
20	to maintain that 24 feet.
21	But he did bring up a good point with the curb,
22	that has to be shown on here, too, with the as-built. So
23	we will have to reconcile that, for sure.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: And I think, sorry, one of
25	the questions was how strong are they, if they are that

	43 CASE NO. PB 20-09
	CASE NO. PD 20-09
1	close to the wall?
2	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: You know, if you're
4	applying force against them from the other direction, you
5	know, what's going to keep them from pushing, you know,
6	over the edge?
7	Looking at it, it's hard to say. I'm not an
8	engineer. But I don't know how deep you have to sink them.
9	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Sure. So they would be
10	installed per the approved detail. That was done on the
11	north side here as well. So the footing is four feet deep,
12	concrete encased. And the bollard itself is a
13	concrete-filled bollard. So it's designed for that
14	purpose.
15	And with respect to the drainpipe, that is
16	installed at the base of the wall. And this wall, you
17	know, goes down deeper than four feet. I think, even on
18	some days, it's six or seven feet, you know, below grade is
19	where this wall was installed. So we should not have I
20	do not expect a conflict with that as well.
21	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay.
22	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Jesse, can you address
23	the comment as to why the retaining wall is curved at the
24	corner rather than a 90-degree angle?
25	MR. JESSE COKELEY: Again, it was to take

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

advantage of the space we had, you know, the property line, it's -- excuse me, the driveway, not property line. The driveway widens here. So it's kind of, you know, some additional space. So rather than squaring off, it curves. That is also to help, you know, direct the water around the corner.

You know, water doesn't necessarily make sharp turns. So rather than square it off and create a situation there, it was curved when it was installed to try to pick up a few more -- some more room.

MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: And if anyone on the Board, correct me if I'm wrong, but the last comment that I wrote down, which we should respond to is, how are the bollards constructed with respect to the asphalt curb that serves as a berm for the storm water drainage.

16 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right. Does it impact the
 17 storm water drainage is the question, I believe.

MR. JESSE COKELEY: Yeah. They will not. But, again, the as-built information that we're going to add to the plan so that you can see these conditions will include that curve and, you know, will account for that in the placement of the bollards.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I think there is one other question that comes up. And then we will talk about how we deal with it when we close this. We're not going to close

45 CASE NO. PB 20-09 the Hearing tonight anyway. But we will tell you how we 1 want to move forward. 2 3 There's still, I think, the elephant in the room is the integrity of that retaining wall, the wall that's 4 5 already there. I know you got a C of O for it and all of that. And we will, obviously, be reviewing that with the 6 7 Building Inspector ourselves. But you may want to review 8 that, too, in light of some of the things that are going That's all. 9 on. 10 We want to make sure that -- I actually like the 11 bollards. I think the bollards are a terrific idea. They 12 are definitely, more likely, to hold a car back than a 13 guardrail. I've seen cars go through guardrails. 14 Although I'm thinking, they're going at 10, 15 15 miles an hour coming in there, or maybe an occasional 16 layperson at 20. But that's about it, okay. And the 17 bollards should help that, for sure. 18 But I just want to make -- we just, you know, we 19 have a little bit of time. We are lucky we have time to 20 dot the I's and cross the T's on this system, I'll call it 21 a system now, it will hold up. That's all. MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: So just to try to 22 23 understand what you are saying is that there is going to be 24 a further review of the wall that was installed? 25 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: No, I didn't say that. Ι

think that Amanda may have said it earlier, and I agree with her 100 percent. This isn't -- that wall is not a site plan issue in our view, okay. It was an existing wall.

5

6

7

8

9

Now, having said that, okay, it wouldn't hurt, I'm just recommending this to you, okay, it wouldn't hurt to double-check that hey, should we be doing something to re-enforce the wall while we're putting in these bollards. That's all I'm saying.

It is not a site plan issue because we're working off an approved as-built, that's why we keep saying as-built, an approved as-built plan, okay. That's our job, okay. And so to the only extent that I would be concerned with the wall from a site plan point of view is if the work that's being done, the bollards being put in, actually weakens the wall, okay.

But then when you do that, you might as well fundamentally find out for sure, in confident, and you come back and say, you know what, the system, new system, is going to work fine for all the questions that we heard tonight, okay.

22 MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Thank you for that 23 clarification.

CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: All right. All right.
DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: Also follow up with

47 CASE NO. PB 20-09 the Engineering Department about the storm water. 1 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The what? I'm sorry. 2 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: Storm water, 3 following up with the Engineering Department about the 4 5 storm water, make sure that the changes to the property regarding the drainage and --6 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Doesn't redirect it. 7 8 Yeah, that's a good point. DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: -- and it meets 9 10 what's required for the property. 11 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Yes. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you, Yeah. 13 If Mr. Bodin has -- Can it be about this site Amanda. 14 plan, Mr. Bodin, please? Appreciate it. For me? 15 MR. MURRAY BODIN: Two things going on. It's called a manual of the Uniform Traffic Control Devices 16 17 because it should be uniform anywhere you go. 18 There is a record both written and video of your 19 engineer saying, well, most people are familiar with that. 20 And why should we worry about it. They have been here before. They know what's going on. 21 22 Do you remember when that was said? Go back and look at the tape. It's called a manual of Uniform Traffic. 23 24 So it's uniform for the person who is not native to the 25 It's for somebody who is a stranger. area.

CASE	NO.	ΡB	20-09
CADE	$\mathbf{I}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{O}$.	БD	20 03

That's probably Valhalla when they ran into the 1 car and Brody's wife was killed. The decision came down 2 yesterday about that, because it wasn't uniform. 3 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: I saw that. 4 5 MR. MURRAY BODIN: Basically. So it's not for the person as your so-called traffic consultant said: 6 Oh, we know about this because we are here all the time. 7 8 It's for the person that comes there who is directed because there was an accident on the Saw Mill. 9 They directed people through Valhalla. Safety means 10 11 anybody who is a stranger should understand it. 12 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: That's a good point. 13 MR. MURRAY BODIN: These traffic engineers have 14 been breaking the law and nobody has stopped them. I'm 15 going to stop them. Because I got nothing to lose. And 16 there is one more thing, Hugh. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes, sir. 18 MR. MURRAY BODIN: Amanda, the Town, is the 19 parliamentarian. A parliamentarian has every right to stop 20 You don't. me. 21 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: Murray, it's not 22 Town Board so actually that's not exactly true here. But 23 thank you for your comment. 24 MR. MURRAY BODIN: We will discuss that another 25 time. But I will not be stopped. I will not be

	49
	CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	interrupted improperly again in my lifetime. And I'm about
2	to speak up. And if they want to carry me out here with
3	three cops, I'll be kicking.
4	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Do you see any policemen
5	here tonight? There aren't any. Any other comments before
6	we tell you what we are going to do?
7	MR. ELIOT SENOR: I just have one comment. I
8	just want to direct the engineer to the proper place. So
9	the Code Section 1607.7.3 of the Residential of the
10	Commercial Building Code State of New York talks about the
11	barrier system and bollards and how to design for them.
12	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you.
13	MR. ELIOT SENOR: Section 1607.7.3.
14	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Thank you very much, Eliot
15	I appreciate it. Does anybody else have comments? Does
16	the Board? The public? Anybody on Zoom for us? No?
17	(Whereupon, there was no response.)
18	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: No.
19	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Unless you have
20	another comment, I'll tell you what we are going to do.
21	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: I do not, no.
22	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. Thank you,
23	everybody, tonight. I think, hopefully, we will end up
24	with a better project out of all of this. And you guys can
25	start living in harmony, please. We need harmony in this

Γ

50 CASE NO. PB 20-09 There isn't any, okay, right now. We need harmony. 1 world. What I would like to do is this, first of all, 2 3 you're going in front of the Zoning Board tomorrow night for, I hope, a final decision, as I understand it, which 4 5 allows you to come back here the next time. By that time, I would hope you'll give us the 6 7 right site plan, hopefully, by the 1st of August or the 8 31st of July. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: So it was indicated 9 10 that you anticipate the surveyor to be out there next week. 11 And then it may take some time for the surveyor to put 12 together that plan. We want to make sure that --13 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: The 30th? The 30th of July, if possible? 14 15 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: That would give 16 enough time for staff to review ahead of scheduling. 17 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: And get it out, because 18 the Planning Board packets go out the Friday before the 19 meeting, generally. 20 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: We want to give the 21 public an opportunity as well before the next meeting. 22 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay. 23 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: July 30th. 24 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: This is what we're going 25 to do. I want to continue the Public Hearing for that

	51 CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	reason, we have to. I want to have the right plan in front
2	of us.
3	However, in deference to the school year coming
4	out and everything else, assuming we can get all of this
5	done and do all the things, please consult with Aaron
6	tomorrow.
7	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Of course.
8	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, who can be very
9	helpful in guiding you that way. We will do the Public
10	Hearing. If everything is right, we can close the Public
11	Hearing and hopefully make a decision on the same night,
12	which we don't normally do.
13	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Why do we need to continue
14	the Public Hearing? I know that we're waiting for
15	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: It's for
16	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Excuse me. I know that
17	we're waiting for the revised site plan. But I assume we
18	can get that before our next work session.
19	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Michael, do you want to
20	answer it, Aaron?
21	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Well, I think it
22	would be appropriate to have that entered I think it
23	would be appropriate to have that into the record an
24	opportunity for the public to look at it and comment on it
25	at a Public Hearing.

52 CASE NO. PB 20-09 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Okay. 1 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: It won't -- it doesn't 2 change the timing, that's why I said --3 4 BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: That answers my question. 5 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you. Anybody else have any other questions? 6 7 BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: In regards to the Public 8 Hearing, does the record stay open another two weeks out --CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes. 9 10 BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: -- after in any event? 11 CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Yes. 12 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: It wouldn't if you 13 did the decision the same day. 14 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: It wouldn't be decided the same night. So that's why we've set the 15 submission deadline for the 30th. 16 17 So there's an opportunity not only for the Board 18 but for members of the public to look at the submission and 19 for staff as well. 20 If everything comes together on the 7th, the 21 Board would be in a position, not obligated to, but could 22 be in a position, I should say, to close that night and 23 make a decision, given the extended period of time that the 24 Public Hearing has been open in connection with this 25 project.

	53 CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Exactly.
2	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Okay.
З	DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MAGANA: If there are
4	remaining issues, you know, the Board could also take a
5	StrawPoll that night.
6	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Could StrawPoll.
7	It could make conditions about any decision.
8	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Right. But if something
9	else comes up, we could continue the Public Hearing.
10	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Right.
11	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: So, you know, we don't
12	know. What I'm saying if everything is there is an
13	opportunity to, at the next meeting, on August 7th, to
14	close it and make a decision that night, which is, you
15	know, the best we can do under the circumstances, okay.
16	MR. MATTHEW DUDLEY, ESQ.: Thank you. I
17	appreciate that, for letting us know that.
18	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you very much.
19	I'll take a motion to close tonight's Public Hearing, this
20	Hearing, please? I'm sorry, we don't need that. Can I
21	have a motion to close the Public Hearing portion of
22	tonight's meeting?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: So moved.
24	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Tom. Do I have a second,
25	please?

	54
	CASE NO. PB 20-09
1	ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON SCHWARTZ: Aisha. All in favor?
3	Aye.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HAY: Aye.
5	BOARD MEMBER GOLDEN: Aye.
6	BOARD MEMBER SNAGGS: Aye.
7	ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBER SPARKS: Aye.
8	(Whereupon, the Public Hearing was concluded.)
9	
10	
11	* * * * * * * * * *
12	
13	CERTIFICATION
14	
15	Certified to be a true and accurate
16	transcript of the Public Hearing of the Greenburgh Planning
17	Board Meeting proceedings held on July 17, 2024, taken by the
18	undersigned, to the best of her ability.
19	
20	
21	Barbara Marciante
22	Barbara Marciante, Official Court Reporter
23	-
24	
25	