

STATE OF NEW YORK: COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER
VILLAGE OF BRONXVILLE

-----X

BRONXVILLE PLANNING BOARD

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
and Site Plan Development Application

-----X

Bronxville Public Library
Bronxville, New York
September 14, 2005
9:00 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

CARBONE & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Tina E. Dinunzio

111 North Central Park Avenue

Hartsdale, New York 10530

(914) 684-0201

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 BRONXVILLE PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

4 DONALD B. HENDERSON JR. - CHAIRMAN

ANNA LONGOBARDO

5 ADRIENNE SMITH

JOHN WESTERFIELD

6 ERIC BLESSING

7 OTHER BRONXVILLE OFFICIALS

8 MARYANN PALERMO - PLANNING COUNSEL

JAMES STAUDT - SPECIAL COUNSEL

9 VINCENT PICI - TOWN ENGINEER

MARILYN TIMPONE MOHAMED - PLANNING CONSULTANT

10 LYDIA BYRNE - SECRETARY

RICHARD CAREY

11

SPECTRUM KENSINGTON LLC - PROJECT TEAM

12

BOB PALEY

13 JOHN SACCARDI

NINA PEEK

14 JOHN COLLINS

JOHN SULLIVAN

15

VENEZIANO & ASSOCIATES

16 Attorneys for the applicant Spectrum Kensington LLC

84 Business Park Drive

17 Suite 200

Armonk, New York 10504

18 BY: MARK MILLER, ESQ.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Here is what we are
2 going to do on Kensington Road and what we
3 hope to accomplish tonight. Where we are
4 is that the applicant has prepared a draft
5 of the Environmental Impact Statement over
6 a couple of meetings. We commented on
7 them and it was redrafted. At our last
8 meeting in July, we declared that it was
9 -- I forgot the technical word, but
10 sufficient for exposure to the public
11 which we made that declaration and it has
12 been exposed and is publically available.
13 And we are going to start the process
14 tonight of reviewing it.

15 We are going to do this over a
16 series of meetings and I'm going to try to
17 announce what we hope to cover at each
18 meeting. The Environmental -- the DEIS is

19 designed with the building in it, that the
20 applicant has proposed and currently is
21 still proposing.

22 Many of you know that it consists
23 of two separate buildings with a sort of
24 driveway circle in the middle and one of
25 the buildings would be the so-called

Proceedings 4

1 mission style and the other building would
2 be the Tudor style.

3 The DEIS also has alternatives.
4 One alternative is to do nothing, which is
5 required under the law. Another
6 alternative is to have two buildings both
7 of the same design. Another alternative
8 is to have one building which would be
9 narrower and not as long, but would be
10 higher. That latter alternative I
11 understand from sort of word of mouth from
12 neighbors and the applicants, that it has
13 generated some interest and we are
14 interested in hearing more about it.

15 So I think what we are going to ask
16 the applicant to do now is to introduce
17 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
18 that they have prepared.

19 The design of the building that is
20 set forth in it as they have proposed, the
21 design of the building, and then also to
22 address alternatives.

23 Now, it's hard -- some of the parts
24 of the DEIS don't matter really and the
25 design of the building. There is stuff

Proceedings

1 about the historic nature of the property,
2 whether there is any architectural ruins
3 there that -- there is a lot of stuff that
4 doesn't really make a lot of difference
5 what the building is. But a lot of it
6 depends on the style of the building and
7 what it is going to look like. So, I
8 don't think we can productively get to the
9 end of this process without first knowing
10 where we are going.

11 What we want to do tonight is, it
12 is not an irrefutable final decision, but
13 we want to at least come to a preliminary
14 view of the Board as to which design we
15 want, and then we want to go down that
16 path from now on, along that one design.
17 Keeping in mind that we can change our
18 minds along the way if the sentiment in

19 the community and among the Board changes
20 as we go along. You can get more
21 information about a particular design as
22 always, but I think we've gotta have an
23 end that we are moving towards, or we
24 can't really productively move forward. I
25 think it's going to take a little bit of

Proceedings

6

1 time to reach that decision, and that is
2 what we want to get done tonight.

3 The other part of we are going to
4 do is to take over the succeeding meeting.

5 We are going to take all the comments from
6 people like the garage, you know, all that
7 kind of stuff. Concerns about
8 construction -- we are going to do all of
9 that. We are going to cover all of that
10 fully. What we are hoping to do tonight
11 is to do this first step which is the most
12 important thing, and that's what we want
13 to do. So --

14 MR. STAUDT: When you are ready to
15 go, you want a motion to open the public
16 hearing on the DEIS Site Plan.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay,
18 who is going to come up?

19 MR. MILLER: Mark Miller. Good
20 evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the
21 Board. My name is Mark Miller and I'm
22 with the Law Firm of Veneziano &
23 Associates, and we are here tonight
24 representing the applicant, WCI.
25 I'm really just going to talk about

Proceedings

7

1 one or two procedural aspects, and with
2 the Board's permission, I will turn it
3 over to our planner, John Saccardi, to
4 actually make the presentation.

5 First for the record and before the
6 meeting began, I provided to James Staudt,
7 your special counsel, various notices of
8 the public hearing. And as Jim indicated,
9 we are here tonight for the DEIS Hearing
10 and the Site Plan Hearing. That required
11 a number of different notices including
12 publication in the Journal News, the Bronx
13 River Press, the Environmental Notice
14 Bulletin; in addition, certified mailings
15 were made to everyone within 400 feet,
16 pursuant to a list provided to us per your
17 code by The Village Administrator. Jim
18 has all the proof of mailing as well as

19 the green receipts that we got back.

20 The final Notice, the DEIS itself

21 and the notice of the DEIS Hearing was

22 provided to this Board and to The Village

23 Board, and to all of the other interested

24 agencies. So Jim has that information.

25 With respect to the public hearing,

Proceedings

1 particularly on the DEIS, the public may
2 not be aware that the environmental review
3 process in New York typically involves two
4 different documents: The first which we
5 are talking about tonight is the Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement. And the
7 purpose of the public hearing is to
8 receive comments from you, and to make
9 sure that we note all of the comments
10 appropriately. We have a stenographer
11 here taking down verbatim everybody's
12 testimony. And so I would ask on the
13 stenographer's behalf, that anyone who
14 speaks, please state your name and spell
15 it so she can get it accurately.

16 Once the DEIS Hearing in however
17 many sessions has been completed, those
18 minutes will be transcribed, and they will

19 form the basis for what is called a Final
20 Environmental Impact Statement.
21 Essentially what will happen is, all the
22 comments will be collated into various
23 topics, similar to what you see in the
24 Draft Environmental Impact Statement:
25 Traffic, noise, storm water, whatever they

Proceedings 9

1 might be, all the comments will be
2 collated and we will prepare a document,
3 the Final Environmental Impact Statement
4 that essentially represents the answers to
5 each of those questions.

6 So tonight, we are here to listen
7 to your comments, to take them down,
8 because all of them will have to be
9 addressed in the Final Environmental
10 Impact Statement. So with that, I will
11 ask John Saccardi to come and make the
12 initial presentation.

13 MR. SACCARDI: Secretary,
14 Mr. Chairman --

15 MR. STAUDT: Do you want to open
16 the public hearing by a motion before
17 Mr. Saccardi starts?

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: I would enter a

19 motion that we open the public hearing on
20 both the Draft Environmental Impact
21 Statement and on the Site Plan
22 Application.

23 MR. BLESSING: So moved.

24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Second?

25 MS. LONGOBARDO: Second.

Proceedings

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

2 (Whereupon, the Board voted

3 unanimately in favor.)

4 MR. SACCARDI: My name is John

5 Saccardi, Principal of the Planning Firm

6 Saccardi and Shift (ph) from White Plains.

7 We are the planners on the project and the

8 principal author of the Environmental

9 Impact Statement. We have a lot of other

10 people who worked with us on the

11 Environmental Impact Statement and many of

12 them are here tonight. From WCI Spectrum

13 and Developers is Bob Paley, who is

14 sitting up in the front row next to the

15 stenographer. To Mark Miller you have

16 already heard from, and next to Mark is

17 Nina Peek from my office who is actually

18 the author of the EIS. In the back corner

19 is John Collins our traffic engineer, and
20 up front who will be making the
21 presentation along with me is John
22 Sullivan, the architect and Chris Localli
23 (ph) from Sullivan architecture.

24 As the Chairman indicated, what we
25 would like to do tonight in this

Proceedings

11

1 presentation is several things: We would
2 like to summarize the key issues in the
3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and
4 really within the context of two plans in
5 particular, of many of the alternatives
6 that we have looked at. One of course, is
7 the proposed Action Plan. The plan that
8 is actually the subject of the EIS. And
9 the second is the alternative that the
10 Chairman highlighted in that the one
11 building alternative that we will show you
12 some diagrams for, because I think the
13 fact it has received some interesting
14 responses that's been put before some
15 people in the Village.

16 The site that we are talking about
17 very quickly is 1.6 acres. It's along
18 Kensington Road and it's a long narrow

19 parcel along Metro North, about 625 feet
20 long and about 100 feet deep. The current
21 use as all of you know, is 179 off-street
22 parking spaces. Basically, three separate
23 parking lots. The existing zoning is
24 residence D and that is a multi-family
25 zone in one of the three locations in The

1 Village where that zoning exists. It
2 allows a multi-family housing of up to six
3 stories in height and age restricted
4 housing.

5 Our proposed action includes a
6 number of different components, but for
7 tonight's purposes, I think three really
8 need to be highlighted: First is the sale
9 of the land. This is Village-owned land
10 and part of the proposed action is that
11 the land would be purchased by WCI
12 Spectrum. The second major component of
13 the proposed action is the Zoning Text
14 Amendment. The Zoning Text Amendment to
15 that resident D zone. That is a Village
16 Board action with the recommendation from
17 the Planning Board.

18 That text amendment if adopted,

19 would require a special permit from the
20 Planning Board to allow age-targeted
21 units. Essentially, units for people 55
22 and older, similar to age restricted, but
23 with different controls. In the
24 age-targeted zone, it would be five
25 stories instead of six and the density

1 would be slightly less.

2 Subsequently, if the zoning
3 proceeds and we receive this special
4 permit after the SEQRA is completed, we
5 would have to get Site Plan approval from
6 the Planning Board. The Site Plan
7 approval would be for the proposed action
8 that we are going to describe tonight. It
9 may end up an alternative, but we have to
10 start with our proposed action. And the
11 proposed action is a 61-unit development
12 in two separate buildings, of two
13 different designs. And that is our
14 proposed action. I would like John
15 Sullivan to come up if you would, and
16 describe that plan to you. Then I will
17 turn it back to Mr. Chairman, and I will
18 go through some of the EIS aspects of the

19 61-units.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: First of all, good
21 evening Mr. Chairman, Board members,
22 ladies and gentlemen. I am John Sullivan,
23 the principal of Sullivan Architecture.
24 We obviously met many times in the past,
25 and I know that all of you and perhaps

1 everyone who is here as well, is very
2 familiar with the proposed Action Plan and
3 John has now identified it.

4 You have seen numerous renditions
5 of this proposal and what I thought we
6 would simply do tonight is to do a very
7 abridged description of this. We don't
8 need to go into all the philosophical and
9 design approaches that we utilized to
10 address this design, but just as a --
11 further back on this, some of the
12 parameters at least to us as design
13 professionals in putting forth a plan that
14 would be most favorable to both the
15 clients and the residents of this town,
16 but in my mind as a professional, I always
17 like to say that my true client are the
18 end users. Those who will be living here

19 and so on.

20 We want to create an environment

21 that is attractive, safe, and one that

22 addresses the needs that the Village put

23 forth in their original RP, which was to

24 create housing, and public parking, as

25 well as the private parking for whatever

Proceedings 15

1 uses it proposed. And this drawing that
2 we have in front of us here (Indicating),
3 I guess I can't take this with me, but on
4 top is an elevation and render elevation
5 of the proposed plan as seen along
6 Kensington Road.

7 The building to the extreme left
8 that is not rendered in, is what's
9 identified as 1 Pondfield Road. That's a
10 medical building that is at the
11 intersection of Pondfield and Kensington.

12 And then of course, the site to the north,
13 which is this building right here
14 (Indicating) and then of course, the
15 elevation moves along Kensington Road.

16 That's the building right here
17 (Indicating).

18 This is Kensington Road. To the

19 east of the site, to the west of the site,
20 then Metro North train tracks, the Harlem
21 line as we all know.

22 As John described the site, the
23 usable aspects of the site in terms of
24 development area is approximately 625 feet
25 by 100 feet in depth. There is a small

1 triangular piece to the extreme north of
2 the site. That is not designated for use
3 as part of this development, but will be
4 landscaped and enhanced. There is an
5 access drive that needs to provide
6 accessibility, vehicle accessibility to
7 the Metro North switching station which is
8 immediately to the north here
9 (Indicating). It's not shown on this
10 plan. Some of the parameters that we
11 looked at and that translated into what I
12 believe is opportunity, is what the site
13 offered us and what are some of the
14 immediate concerns surrounding the context
15 that we needed to respond to. And
16 probably the most sensitive of all of
17 those to us was Christ Church, which is
18 directly across the center of this site in

19 this area here (Indicating).

20 As we all know, that's very

21 important for its purpose and that it

22 serves the community, and it has aspects

23 to it that require sensitivity towards for

24 example, light. And that you don't block

25 the light filtering through a wonderful

1 stained window into a worship space.

2 That area happens to be right at
3 the point here (Indicating). So
4 consequently as we approached this, we
5 wanted to do something that allowed for
6 that clear light and not an interruption
7 of shadow or a disturbance to that, and as
8 it began to describe to us that we had an
9 opportunity to do two buildings on the
10 site as opposed to one long building.

11 It immediately opened up other
12 design opportunities. Two smaller
13 buildings to improve pedestrian scale as
14 you traverse the street. Opportunity, as
15 what is illustrated above, to look at two
16 styles of architecture. Two styles of
17 architecture that are rather indigenous to
18 Bronxville. I think we need immediate

19 surrounding context again.

20 My greatest accomplishment would be

21 that in ten years, if this were

22 implemented, if someone walked up the

23 street they would say, wait, this was

24 built at one time, this looks like two

25 different projects, two different

1 buildings; success. From the design
2 perspective and in my mind.

3 It also afforded those who live
4 here. As I stated, a number of our
5 primary clientele, the ultimate users and
6 owners of these apartments, that they have
7 greater opportunities that also translates
8 to my client. Their opportunity of
9 diversity of product and in the marketing
10 of this project, be all that it is only
11 about 60, 61 units.

12 So, we started then to take our
13 plan and to set the buildings on top of a
14 plaza deck that sits over two levels of
15 parking. One level will contain
16 approximately 200 parking spaces that will
17 be given to The Village for the Village's
18 use towards the residents and the

19 commuters that utilize the Metro North.

20 That would be the upper level of the

21 garage. And then the lower level would

22 basically be designated towards the

23 parking for the residents of this

24 building.

25 On that deck, there will be the

Proceedings

19

1 plaza which more -- as I in the past tried
2 to identify it as an Italian Piazza, which
3 would really mix architectural styles, my
4 apologies here, but we don't want it to
5 feel like just a concreted over plaza. It
6 needs to be sensitively landscaped, a
7 paving pattern put in, pedestrian lanes
8 that are very easily defined; it all works
9 towards softening of that type of use and
10 that it's really meant to be nothing more
11 than a central open space to allow the
12 light as I described earlier, and to
13 provide entrances into either one of the
14 buildings. A drop-off point, a pick-up
15 point, UPS trucks, a taxi; John stated
16 that our primary clientele is age
17 restricted. Seniors, older people -- in a
18 year from now, I could live here, but

19 maybe we don't all need a car to run into
20 town to get something. That's the purpose
21 of that.

22 There would not be any entrances
23 into the parking garages from that area.

24 The only primary entrance to that garage
25 will be the only entrance to that garage

1 that is at -- at the immediate southern
2 end of the site which is shown right there
3 (Indicating). It is abutting 1 Pondfield.
4 That is illustrated as being a door, and
5 that they are also provided some security
6 at the entrance into that garage. And
7 that point of that garage in this little
8 area here (Indicating), that is really
9 expressed and exposed above the street
10 line of Kensington. Because as we know,
11 Kensington has a slight curve to it and
12 the high point is where you enter into the
13 site.

14 The buildings are not identical and
15 you can see that from the footprints here
16 (Indicating). One is slightly larger. We
17 carefully stepped the building back on
18 Kensington Road so that there was a

19 diversity of facade treatments both
20 horizontally and vertically. That we
21 landscaped these areas and we identified
22 them in some text as little pocket parks.
23 I'm not quite sure that is the appropriate
24 terminology, but it was the intent to
25 describe what the feel of that space would

1 be as a landscaped garden. And again,
2 that is just a hard scape. A combination
3 of soft scape and hard scape treatments to
4 that area.

5 As John stated, there were about 61
6 units. The total building is less
7 department structure about 110,000 square
8 feet. One of the criteria in that the
9 Village presented in their RP, was that a
10 maximum height of fifty feet be for the
11 buildings and we did not exceed that
12 height for this building. As you can see,
13 it tapers down at the end vertically as
14 well as horizontally.

15 So in essence, that is an overview
16 of the project philosophically from where
17 and how we approached the design, and some
18 of the goals that we tried to accomplish.

19 MR. SACCARDI: Thanks John. Those
20 of you that have had a chance to look over
21 the Environmental Impact Statement, I
22 think in the first chapter it has a very
23 detailed description of the proposed
24 action. It includes most of John's
25 drawings and includes some other maps and

1 other descriptions of zoning. But it's
2 really the chapters that follow that.
3 It's the chapters that discuss the impact
4 of the proposed development. It's the
5 heart of the Environmental Impact
6 Statement. It's a lengthy document, but I
7 thought Mr. Chairman, if I could highlight
8 some of the items and provide some basis
9 for some of the comments from the public
10 as we well as the Board, although
11 certainly, you are free to comment on any
12 aspect of the project or the Impact
13 Statement.

14 The first chapter is on land use.
15 And what we did on land use is we looked
16 at the surrounding development as John
17 mentioned, and we also looked at the 2002
18 Comprehensive Plan in the Village and

19 other planning documents. And we noticed
20 that in particular that it is -- we
21 believe it is the surrounding context of
22 existing land use and as John described,
23 but also with the planning documents for
24 the community.

25 Interesting to note as I go through

Proceedings

23

1 this, the impact analyses are for the
2 61-unit project. Many of the impact
3 analyses as the Chairman clearly stated
4 are for a 55-unit single building project
5 and it would be the same or slightly less.
6 So land use certainly would be in that
7 category.

8 Under demographics and subsequent
9 chapters, we note that based on our
10 projections and the statistical material
11 we have, there would be about 126
12 residents in the 61 units. This is an
13 age-targeted project that is for seniors,
14 and we figure about two persons per
15 dwelling.

16 That is followed by traffic and we
17 have done extensive traffic impact studies
18 by Collins Engineers, and there is a lot

19 of detail in that section of the
20 Environmental Impact Statement. But given
21 the proximity to the railroad and the
22 likely fact that many of the residents
23 would be railroad commuters, the traffic
24 analyses indicated that there will be 37
25 morning trips and 43 evening trips on the

1 area intersection that we studied in
2 detail. So they are intersections that
3 presently exist under existing conditions
4 for the driveways, to the parking area;
5 under future conditions, that would be the
6 driveway to our proposed parking garage.
7 The traffic circle of course, which is
8 very important and some of the areas in
9 the intersection as well.

10 Staying on the general topic, we
11 are going to be displacing 179 parking
12 spaces. We counted the number of parkers
13 in the parking spaces and while that is
14 not definitive because it was a selected
15 survey, the highest we got was 73 percent.
16 That was about 130 parkers in that lot.
17 The real number that we have to relate to
18 is 179. We are providing 200, but when we

19 surveyed the parking lot, it wasn't fully

20 utilized.

21 The Chairman pointed out that not

22 only did we look at the surrounding land

23 uses, we looked at what is under the

24 ground as well. Again, this applies to

25 whether it is a 61-unit or a 55-unit

1 project.

2 We looked at the underground area
3 in terms of -- particularly as it relates
4 to what the uses were prior to the
5 development here. There was an auto
6 repair use, there is a gas station, there
7 was a power plant. And frankly, and the
8 DEIS clearly notes that there is some
9 contaminated soil on the site that has to
10 be removed and capped, and that is subject
11 to DEC controls and The Village engineer
12 will be looking very closely at that as
13 well as other engineering studies that
14 document that. It is an important part of
15 the project and there are important
16 benefits of the project too, that the
17 situation will be cleaned up as part of
18 the development.

19 While we are on engineering, of
20 course we have sections on water supply,
21 on sanitary, sewer, and on storm water
22 management. Again, those will be looked
23 at carefully by The Village engineer as
24 well as a consultant.

25 We got into of course, like any

1 EIS, into the tax revenues. The tax
2 revenue -- what our lowest projection is
3 over a 1 million dollars a year for a
4 61-unit project. If there was 55 units,
5 it would be a little less. Actually, our
6 range is from 1 million to 1.3 million for
7 the development. The definitive answer on
8 that comes later, but we think this will
9 be a very upscale project and they think
10 that the tax benefits will be very much
11 substantial. Particularly, when we look
12 at the next chapter.

13 What are the services that we will
14 provide? Starting with the schools.
15 49 percent of the tax revenue goes to the
16 Bronxville Schools. This is not an
17 age-restricted project so the Planning
18 Board very wisely made us look at three

19 different scenarios. One, is it
20 successful as we think it will be. That
21 there will no school-aged children in the
22 project. And two other scenarios that if
23 there were 25 percent of the units with
24 families, or if there were 50 percent of
25 the units with families, we ran though the

1 statistical analysis from the various
2 source projections and looked at other
3 data that we have in our office for
4 building near train stations, and we came
5 up with a maximum of 5 school-aged
6 children. In any event, whether you like
7 that number or not, the overwhelming
8 factor will be just a modest number and we
9 think zero school-aged children, and a
10 very strong net benefit of taxes in the
11 school district.

12 Similarly, there should be
13 beneficial tax revenues for The Village.
14 We don't believe based upon correspondence
15 that there will be an impact on police,
16 fire, public works; we will have a private
17 carting service taking care of the garbage
18 from the development. Recreation, there

19 may be some use of Village and town
20 recreation facilities as we have the 126
21 new residents in the community.

22 The open space that we will be
23 providing on the site as John described,
24 are basically passive recreation
25 facilities. I think a lot of the people

1 that will live here will really take
2 advantage of the downtown stores and
3 shops, and I think that is an important
4 "recreation" facility, given the different
5 locations and the kind of population we
6 expect in the development.

7 And finally, two more. We looked
8 at in detail at noise and vibrations. We
9 had a noise study done. The noise study
10 specifically looked at traffic and induced
11 noise, but here we have some very
12 particular issues to deal with. Railroad
13 noise, and whether there will be reflected
14 noise based on the location of our
15 proposed building adjacent to the railroad
16 tracks. Will noise bounce off the
17 building? Will the noise from the
18 railroad affect the design of our

19 building; that is certainly an important
20 consideration. And more so, what noise
21 and vibration impact might be during
22 construction. Particularly for Christ
23 Church and the stained glass windows.

24 We have a mitigation program for
25 how we would work with the Church in terms

1 of making sure that there would be no
2 adverse impacts and that all impacts would
3 be mitigated.

4 And finally, which John showed you
5 a little bit of, we looked at visual
6 impact. And the visual impact analyses
7 that we provided in the DEIS for the
8 proposed action included photo
9 simulations, included elevation Site Plan,
10 included render, included a whole series
11 of techniques that the planning Board was
12 concerned about to try and address the
13 visual image of the design. That went for
14 the two building design, the one building
15 design and also for the alternative that
16 we will describe for a minute in terms of
17 the single building itself and that
18 alternative.

19 Alternatives are an important part
20 of any EIS. As the Chairman pointed out,
21 we had to look at no available
22 alternatives; leave it alone; leave it the
23 way it is. We looked at alternatives that
24 address the residential zoning, without
25 the zoning proposals that we are talking

1 about, multi-family alternatives. We
2 looked at the previous age-restricted
3 development that was probably about ten
4 years ago and what would that mean? How
5 would these alternatives compare to our
6 proposed action?

7 We looked at the single design
8 treatments that John described before,
9 instead of two separate designs. And we
10 looked finally at that alternative which
11 would have one building. And that
12 alternative with one building would be 55
13 units, not 61, so many, if not all of the
14 many impacts would be less than the 61
15 alternative. It would be six stories in
16 height, and it would have a 20,000 square
17 foot open pace in the southern portion.

18 If the Planning Board decides that

19 that alternative is something that they
20 still in fact want to pursue, that
21 alternative will become a part of the
22 proposed action in the FEIS analyses, in
23 as much detail as you would call for,
24 although, I think many of the studies
25 still apply. And it's important to note

1 that our agreement to The Village as the
2 proposed zoning, it would have to be
3 modified and make sure that the
4 alternative if you want to pursue it,
5 really applies with all the regulations
6 that we have before you.

7 I think the last part of our
8 presentation Mr. Chairman, would be to
9 show that alternative and then turn it
10 back to you for your discussion.

11 MR. SULLIVAN: Just before we put
12 the drawing up, because we just have the
13 one -- both of these drawings and the one
14 you see here and the one I am to going to
15 put up are on the same scale, same size,
16 same drawing, same size sheet; take note
17 of the plan footprint and in particular,
18 to the area on the southern part of the

19 deck here (Indicating). This is the
20 building you will see in a second that we
21 will maybe move or replace. And take a
22 look at this building and the architecture
23 you see and the size and the height of
24 that building. And now let's look at the
25 other alternative. Chris, can you put

1 this up?

2 We just looked at that for one
3 minute and then you can sort of look and
4 compare and quickly see that the first
5 glaring difference is that there is only
6 one building on the site and that the
7 building to the south, 1 Pondfield is not
8 there. The building had about that line
9 right there (Indicating), is where the
10 same height is. The previous building was
11 four stories at a maximum height, this is
12 six. And we can see where the top two
13 floors are shown on this building.

14 Architecturally, it has the very
15 same elements of the previous ones and the
16 same stepping down at the ends and the
17 same undulations horizontally which we can
18 see in the plan. Here is the footprint of

19 the building. We still see they are the
20 same material undulations, the same set
21 back along Kensington with some evergreens
22 -- not evergreens, but some green space;
23 the same entrance, slightly different.
24 This one is more of a piazza, if you
25 would, than a circle that I had before.

1 But it is on the same axis with Christ
2 Church. So we retained the relationship
3 that we so desperately wanted to and it
4 was our goal to begin with.

5 By the elimination of the building
6 to the south end, it affords us an
7 opportunity to create open space. If I
8 could editorialize, perhaps more of a
9 meaningful and functional open space as a
10 park. You heard here earlier that the
11 previous plan had little pocket parks that
12 are -- while, they may be open space, and
13 they function very nicely for someone to
14 sit quietly and read if one so desires to
15 do there, now we have something that is
16 more of a classic little village/park. It
17 is set on top of the parking structure, it
18 is accessible from the high point of the

19 road, and there are other step locations
20 from the sidewalk if you were able to walk
21 up a half flight of stairs so you can get
22 to that space.

23 What has been illustrated here at
24 this point, is nothing more than an
25 example of what that park could be.

Proceedings

34

1 Perhaps a mosque of shade trees set on the
2 lawn with lower vegetation around the
3 perimeter.

4 The design of that park is clearly
5 open for discussion and design. But it's
6 the overall context of the site that we
7 wanted to really evaluate. This building
8 which approximately sits in the same size
9 location at the previous, with two
10 additional floors, same style of
11 architecture, same sensitivity toward
12 vertically stepping back and forth --
13 Chris, can you help me with this one other
14 drawing? Just put this up there
15 (Indicating). And you don't have to open
16 it. On the bottom of this drawing -- if
17 we set it up here Chris, that would be
18 fine.

19 I know it may be difficult for all
20 of you to see -- I think we do have a
21 problem, I apologize. Let's try to hold
22 it up. It's so small in this form and
23 what we see here is -- and I hope this is
24 understandable by all of you, but this is
25 really a site section and elevation of

1 that building that we are looking at here.
2 This is an un rendered version of the same
3 drawing of what you were just looking at.
4 What you see here is the elevation looking
5 -- is the south elevation or the one that
6 faces that park. Take this, and if you
7 cut through the structure, you can faintly
8 see the two levels of parking. We can see
9 the outline of Christ Church and the
10 steeple. It kind of gives us a
11 relationship of those -- even though the
12 two buildings are not directly across from
13 one another, but I wanted to point out
14 that the top floor, six and five, and
15 four, step back from the front of the
16 building.

17 Even as we further develop the
18 design, we will retain that, because what

19 are we trying to do? -- let's take this
20 down Chris. While this is an elevation
21 drawing, I'm sure most of you if you read
22 it, it's rather flat and two dimensional.
23 It's not three dimensional obviously, and
24 I want to make certain that you understood
25 that the face of this building is not six

Proceedings

36

1 stories. If you are a pedestrian and you
2 were on the street, you would only see the
3 four story building because of how the
4 back two floors step back. I think that
5 is important when we look at this and
6 evaluate the building and try to stretch
7 it up. And the fact that we have a taller
8 building, what we really mean is for it to
9 be meaningful for public use, not just for
10 private use of the park to the south of
11 that structure.

12 MS. LONGOBARDO: John, you might
13 want to say how far back it steps. You
14 told us during our Design Review meeting
15 that there is an appreciable stepping back
16 and I think that we need to understand it.

17 MR. SULLIVAN: The step back is
18 anywhere -- because of what the average is

19 ten-foot steps, so the upper two floors

20 have a rather attractive roof-top

21 balconies. We are on the role of the

22 previous applicant, but this doesn't have

23 a pool. I'm criticizing my own work.

24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you get any

25 ideas?

1 MR. SULLIVAN: I think we can get a
2 pool up there, but no, sorry. No, not in
3 this case. That is not a good idea,
4 because we are building on the deck and we
5 don't want to support all of that load.
6 They do step back so the upper two floors
7 will have very attractive penthouse style
8 apartments. So all though they are
9 duplexes in this building, they have roof
10 terraces up there so that the space as you
11 step back and your line of vision is what
12 I was trying to show in the previous one,
13 is somewhat diminished and you don't
14 really realize that they are up there.
15 Obviously, it provides a wonderful
16 opportunity for some terrific apartments
17 on that level. So did I answer that?

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Just to clarify on

19 the park area, it is intended that it be

20 open to the public?

21 MR. SULLIVAN: Absolutely. This is

22 a public park clearly for those who live

23 here as well as anyone else. It is

24 accessible to the handicapped. It is on a

25 level -- again, I think if you ask me what

1 the paving patterns are, I can't say right
2 now, but it will be a classical urban
3 quiet park space except for when the train
4 goes by.

5 MR. WESTERFIELD: Is the number of
6 parking spaces provided in the alternative
7 the same?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Absolutely the same.
9 The plaza deck down, same plan.

10 MR. BLESSING: Is there still an
11 entrance where taxis come in that are not
12 in the center of the building --

13 MR. SULLIVAN: It is in the exact
14 same spot as the previous one, because
15 that is the highest point of Kensington
16 where we can integrate our level access at
17 that point and have the parking structure
18 work below. And that is where the

19 accessibility aspect comes in. Anyone in
20 this building, once they exit the
21 building, you are on Kensington and can
22 traverse the sidewalks and so on. And I
23 think it is important to have a few other
24 small half-flight stairs, if you would --
25 it's very hard to see here (Indicating),

1 but we illustrated them on the drawings
2 that allow for obviously, a
3 non-handicapped individual that can
4 negotiate from the Kensington sidewalk up
5 to the deck and not have to walk down here
6 and back and forth. So the placement of
7 those is open for further discussion and
8 review, but it's fully -- I'll also share
9 with you that it's not related to this,
10 but this building is fully -- it's
11 required to be fully handicapped
12 accessible; every apartment. That doesn't
13 mean they are built as handicapped units,
14 but they have to be accessible units. The
15 turning radius, the sizes of the doors, et
16 cetera. It is also frankly a good thing
17 to do in my opinion, in terms of just the
18 style of unit that we created, and we meet

19 those criteria.

20 A lot of the bathrooms will be

21 large enough by design, but will be easily

22 accessible for anyone who becomes even

23 handicapped at a later date. Simple

24 things such as grab bars will not be

25 installed in the bathroom, but all the

1 structural requirements in the wall are
2 there to simply apply the grab bar when
3 needed to be.

4 Again, I looked at those as
5 opportunities for a particular or a
6 targeted market. And the other reason is
7 the building codes require it.

8 MS. LONGOBARDO: John, would you
9 discuss those -- they look like terraces
10 to me and when you presented them to me at
11 the Design Review Committee -- I know they
12 are not final and they can be changed and
13 so on, but it's an interesting way of
14 stepping down again, and you might want to
15 --

16 MR. SULLIVAN: In the spirit of
17 trying to create the diversity on the
18 facade of these buildings, either one of

19 these, this or the proposed Action Plan
20 that we have and a series of what we call
21 Juliet balconies on many many of the units
22 here, which means they are not a projected
23 deck. I find those troubling in the urban
24 context, because they become kind of like
25 little junk yards, but this allows for the

1 use of the wonderful french doors that you
2 can open and have a railing and be able to
3 at least experience the outdoors. They
4 are sporadically located, not in any
5 particular design or rhythm -- again, not
6 to have a take on that characteristic.
7 They are particularly at the plaza deck.
8 Those units that are right a long this
9 facade here, have a small pervious and
10 outdoor terrace spaces at that level. So
11 really based on some of those, we are
12 really trying for a little intimate like
13 private garden spaces for that unit with
14 the use of pervious structure and sort of
15 arbor that creates a sense of space and
16 creates a sense of pedestrian and human
17 scale.

18 Again, that is something that's

19 very familiar here in Bronxville. We
20 could go around to many of the smaller
21 townhouses in The Village and we will find
22 those. And as a matter of fact, we even
23 have a few of those perhaps located on the
24 upper level up here. Again, they afford
25 shade, they afford comfortable pedestrian

1 space and they are a nice amenity and an
2 attraction for those who will live there.
3 There is one right there as a matter of
4 fact (Indicating).

5 While we are clearly showing a
6 rather advanced design here, it does need
7 to be worked out. We need to incorporate
8 the fenestration as we have it illustrated
9 here with the alternate floor plans as we
10 are continuing to develop, but we are very
11 much anxious to do that with your
12 assistance to move onto whichever concept
13 and building design we are going with.

14 Okay, John?

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Any more questions?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: However, you want to
17 proceed.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe they had a

19 design review committee that reports --

20 MS. LONGOBARDO: Two or three

21 members of the design review committee did

22 hear the presentation by John and Mr.

23 Paley and we were favorably impressed.

24 And I think the idea of really getting a

25 substantial park which is almost -- we

Proceedings

43

1 scaled it off about 250 feet long by
2 100 feet wide, a big enough space so that
3 it really adds green space to our Village
4 and we would like to keep it and maintain
5 it. And going from an ugly parking to a
6 park makes a big difference. Not every --
7 as we haven't gotten the final approval of
8 the design review comments, but again, the
9 idea of stepping back both north and south
10 and also east and west, so it isn't like a
11 model with a six-story building. It's
12 appealing to us very much and our third
13 member, we talked a bit about it and in
14 general, favorably commented. So I think
15 as an advisory committee to the Planning
16 Board, we would feel this alternative
17 should be the one we consider as a serious
18 first alternative.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we will take
20 comments from the public. As I mentioned,
21 we are seeking your input and assistance
22 tonight on deciding on which way to go,
23 and I will prefer that what which we
24 talked about as this public hearing goes,
25 you can say whatever you want, but we are

1 soliciting your views to help us decide on
2 which of these alternatives that we would
3 like. Dorothy?

4 MS. BRENNAN (ph): Dorothy Brennan.

5 I now live on Kensington Road when we
6 fought the Kensington development some
7 years back, I lived on Sagamore and
8 Beckett Court (ph). A 41-year resident of
9 The Village. First of all, some questions
10 that perhaps The Village administrator can
11 answer. The property is owned by The
12 Village, by the taxpayers of The Village,
13 and when they tried to develop it before,
14 they could not sell the property. That
15 was not legally allowed. So they had to
16 lease it and I wanted to know if they have
17 done that this time? Are they leasing
18 this property to the builder?

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Jim Staudt is going

20 to answer that question. This is Jim

21 Staudt who is acting as the attorney for

22 The Village, special counsel for The

23 Village on this.

24 MR. STAUDT: The contract as

25 proposed is for a sale with a permanent

1 easement back to The Village for The
2 Village parking.

3 MS. BRENNAN: We had Village
4 parking before and they still couldn't do
5 that. They still had to lease it. So I
6 would like a little more work on that if
7 you don't mind.

8 Now, I want the people to
9 understand that this piece of property is
10 longer than the Bronxville School. You
11 are all familiar with the length of the
12 school, and the sidewalks are exactly five
13 feet wide in the upside up Kensington
14 Road, and it is twelve feet from the
15 railroad station in the back.

16 This design is not bad. I don't
17 like the other one because the pseudo of
18 the Avalon has really been not as good as

19 we hoped it would be, but this looks not
20 bad. But I'm very concerned about the
21 size, because you are talking 61-units at
22 the highest point on Kensington Road, so I
23 don't know how that is going to equate
24 what it looks like from Alga Court (ph),
25 and I don't know what it is going to

1 equate back to like the people who live in
2 the townhouses that face this. The park
3 area, I don't know what the railroad said
4 about drilling or doing any blasting for
5 the garage, but that consideration could
6 be somewhat dangerous. I'm wondering what
7 the MTA said about that, but I just feel
8 that the 61 units --

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: 55.

10 MS. BRENNAN: 55 units is fairly
11 big for that piece of property. Now, I
12 know you want to build as much as you can
13 for the economy of it, but we have to
14 think about The Village too. You have
15 given consideration to Christ Church which
16 we appreciate, but was one of our big
17 stumbling blocks the last time. And what
18 about the integrity of the railroad and

19 the parking lot? That was one of the
20 questions I had here. And then the
21 course, I would like to know -- and this
22 is one of the most important things for me
23 once this thing starts -- and I'm not
24 going to fight it this time. I'm too old
25 and weary, but the parking and the traffic

1 for the people, and the people -- remember
2 that the people that are using that
3 parking now work in The Village. We are
4 having problems with our little Village
5 because of the parking, because many of
6 our shops are not taken because people
7 can't get parking to come to visit our
8 shops. People are not coming in. And
9 just for the period of time that this is
10 going to be built might kill us. Christ
11 Church is going to be impacted by it,
12 certainly the Alga Court (ph) is going to
13 be impacted by it; they have a lot of
14 parking spaces over here too because of
15 their overflow. All of the people that
16 park there from Kensington and Sagamore
17 Roads now will be impacted by these things
18 and you will have to look into it.

19 I also think you are going to have
20 to get your employees and workmen there to
21 park on may be the Dewitt Bridge, because
22 they wont' be able to park in our area.
23 There just isn't any parking. And what,
24 two 1/2 years you figure it will take?
25 Give or take? All right.

Proceedings 48

1 I don't understand the private
2 carting for your garbage. If you are
3 paying taxes to The Village, I don't
4 understand why you are going to pay for
5 your garbage. Is that a definite thing or
6 just to sweeten the pot?

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me sort of set
8 the stage a little bit. What we are
9 talking about is the way that this process
10 is intended to work; is that all the
11 comments come in and sort of get answered
12 in the final report. Having said that, we
13 operate with some formality of it, but
14 also we operate with some informality with
15 a small Village, so I think to the extent
16 that you can answer it quickly, the
17 questions that are likely to have a
18 factual nature, I invite you to do that,

19 but you have to come up to the microphone.

20 You might just want to hang around up

21 there.

22 MR. SACCARDI: All of your

23 questions which are very good, will be

24 answered in the FEIS. We do understand

25 your questions about the construction

1 impacts and we think it is a two-year
2 construction project, not two 1/2, but
3 during the construction, there will be
4 impact. They are outlined in the EIS and
5 I think the impact on parking during
6 construction is certainly one that --

7 MS. BRENNAN: There is impacts also
8 on the little restaurants we have down
9 there. A lot of things.

10 MR. SACCARDI: They are very
11 serious impacts and they are covered in
12 the EIS, but we will answer your questions
13 in particular. The proposal for private
14 carting in the -- the proposal is that the
15 garbage will be collected in the basement,
16 the shoot, and will be brought out to the
17 street and picked up by private carters.
18 That's not cast in stone, but that is our

19 proposal right now.

20 MS. BRENNAN: I just wanted to be

21 sure that you understand that the affect

22 on The Village is going to be really

23 intense for those two 1/2 years for that

24 parking. Every part of The Village will

25 be affected by it. I want you to know at

1 the get go because I have many more
2 questions and I wanted that place to be
3 used just for parking in that whole area.
4 I had great plans for it, but of course
5 they never came to fruition. I had
6 already planned and I already have a lot
7 of people that want to buy the spots, but
8 nonetheless, we won't waste your time with
9 that. I'll be back again.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Dorothy
11 did give us her view on the design which
12 we appreciate and she favors the one
13 design approach, which is something we are
14 specifically asking for your input on. We
15 invite you to speak and whoever wants to
16 speak next, if you would kind of move in
17 that direction to keep things moving.

18 MS. CAREY: My name is Bonnie Carey

19 C-A-R-E-Y, and I live at Kensington
20 Terrace directly across from the project.
21 I do prefer the first design, umm, to me,
22 this looks very much like a hotel that is
23 just kind of not connected to anything
24 that flows like the first project. I also
25 want to make a comment on the fact that

Proceedings 51

1 people were brought in to do an
2 Environmental Impact Study in various
3 areas, and yet, no one asked the people
4 who are directly impacted by this project.
5 Umm, I did go out one morning and see
6 someone doing a traffic survey whatever,
7 and yet, I could tell, you know, the
8 problems that already exist there, and
9 that are not addressed by The Village.

10 Umm, as well as other problems, you
11 know, the parking problems, snow removal
12 problems, all those kinds of things, as
13 one of the Board members brought up, we
14 are looking at ugly parking spaces. They
15 don't have to be ugly parking spaces. We
16 have a Village Beautification Committee
17 that comes and then stops the circle there
18 at the end of Kensington. Kensington is a

19 disgrace to this Village, and this is why

20 I think that the project will be good.

21 But I'm very disappointed in the way that

22 The Village has handled the Kensington

23 area; the parking problems, the traffic

24 problems, the landscaping problems, and so

25 I hope that Spectrum will, you know, make

1 any improvements needed because it is an
2 affected. Thank you.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

4 MS. CALLAHAN: My name is Cindy
5 Callahan C-A-L-L-H-A-N, I live at 2325
6 Sagamore Road. We have a back building
7 immediately parallel across the street at
8 24 Kensington Road. Our building which is
9 a historical building to Westchester
10 County is, along with Christ Church, the
11 two main buildings that are impacted by
12 this. We have from the very beginning
13 been very positive about having this
14 property rehabilitated. It has been
15 needed for years.

16 I really appreciate the first plan
17 that you designed. I thought it was so
18 thoughtful to the church with the windows,

19 and it was thoughtful for our building.

20 It recommended the architecture of the

21 area. You're right, I don't like the

22 Tudor style of the Avalon, but I also

23 think that you can use that to improve

24 upon it. It doesn't mean that you are

25 concrete in this design -- I'm sorry, I'm

Proceedings

53

1 nervous. Although that idea of the park
2 is beautiful, I'm a whole believer for
3 open space and also, I'm not so sure it's
4 placed and why it's placed there is the
5 right thing. I understand it being placed
6 because you are giving thought to Christ
7 Church to keep that area open so that the
8 light comes in through the stained glassed
9 windows, but in the same place, you are
10 taking an oversized building which is not
11 congruent with the remaining buildings
12 it's next to and you are shoving it over
13 into the other corner, I don't think that
14 is right. I don't think it's congruent to
15 the building. I don't think it's fair to
16 the property and it's out of place. And
17 it's a beautiful building. It's a
18 beautiful building.

19 My number one concern has been the
20 same concern for years already. If we
21 have on-going traffic problems on
22 Kensington Road -- I want to see this
23 building come, but I want to see that the
24 traffic situation there is addressed. It
25 is addressed with regards to the parking

1 underneath the property which is great,
2 but what isn't addressed -- and we are
3 also impacting the park is that you have
4 that triangle which is Blue Moon, the
5 medical building and Christ Church, it is
6 already a dangerous intersection which is
7 not being monitored and I don't see how
8 either plan really addresses that. And
9 that triangle is used as a drop off and a
10 pick up for commuters who are hoping to
11 forth come, it is used by the Blue Moon
12 the restaurant which commonly at any time
13 during the day or night, double parked for
14 the people who go to the restaurant to
15 eat; in addition to that, the regular
16 traffic itself. So my real question comes
17 down to, I like plan two, I don't want it
18 in my neighborhood. I love plan one, but

19 how is parking going to be? Not just the
20 parking, but traffic in general. How is
21 it going to be addressed? And that
22 includes by the way, going all the way
23 from the triangle, all the way up past
24 Beach Tree which is really the first stop
25 where the main problem starts. Beach Tree

1 is not viewable when you try to take a
2 left-hand turn from Beach Tree on to
3 Kensington Road, you have to go three
4 quarters into the street to even see if
5 you can make a left-hand turn on whether
6 traffic is on-coming as well.

7 Unfortunately, a number of us have missed
8 a few cars and it's a problem. So that is
9 really my question, how is that going to
10 be addressed? Thank you.

11 MR. MURPHY: Don, I apologize, but
12 age makes the hearing difficult. As good
13 as this room is and as Dorothy said last
14 night, we hope we learned from here and
15 approve The Village Hall. So questions of
16 John, I think you said that design one, I
17 think it's bringing into design two, you
18 are still talking 300 parking spaces all

19 together; correct? 200 on the upper level
20 of parking which is closer to the street
21 and 100 below and then I wasn't sure I was
22 hearing because it changed back and forth
23 as these discussions have been progressed.
24 I think the discussion was that the 200
25 would be on the upper level and 100 would

1 be the lower level. So it would be the
2 residents, et cetera, and all of that are
3 separated from the coming and going of the
4 public; is that correct?

5 JOHN SULLIVAN: That's correct.

6 MR. MURPHY: Secondly, I must say
7 after 22 years I have been looking at --
8 I really like your -- this last rendition.
9 I'm a little -- can't quite decide where
10 the loop that you put in a year or two ago
11 to bring cars in on the north side, it
12 seems to still be there but I am not sure
13 you are planning it that way for an
14 entrance and it's really one thing that
15 always throws me off. We never see the
16 damn Metro North substation that is right
17 next to it, and I think for your purposes
18 that you don't want to really show the

19 tracks, but it's there. Is that entrance

20 still in there?

21 MR. SULLIVAN : Good question,

22 Bill. I tell you what --

23 MR. MURPHY: I'm sorry, I didn't

24 introduce myself. Bill Murphy.

25 MR. SULLIVAN: For whatever reason

Proceedings

57

1 commuters do these things, I like to blame
2 them, not us. But here is that building
3 that you are asking me about, Bill. That
4 is what I alluded to earlier on the other
5 drawing where it was not illustrated, but
6 that is the Metro North switching station
7 you are referring to. I would like to
8 convince these guys, I would like to put
9 at great facade on that building too, but
10 any event, what you are asking about is
11 there is sort of like, if you will, a half
12 of a helix or half of a circle any way,
13 that allows the vehicles to traverse from
14 the upper level to the lower level in the
15 parking structure, and we now are
16 suggesting covering that over. That is
17 what this is right here (Indicating). If
18 it becomes part of the plaza, we can

19 landscape that so you can no longer see

20 it. There is not an entrance into this

21 park --

22 MR. MURPHY: You were getting some

23 concerns from particularly the terrace

24 people and others who are anticipating

25 lights and everything else directly in

1 their windows.

2 MR. SULLIVAN: That will not happen
3 now. There is not an entrance --

4 MR. MURPHY: I think it's important
5 that The Village hears about that.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. I want
7 to clarify it. While the deck extends out
8 is to allow for the moveability below all
9 this. It is now internalized and there
10 was not -- there may be a window in there
11 to give some designed to this which we
12 discussed, but the impact on off site or
13 for lights, I think is significantly, if
14 not totally eliminated, but at least
15 significantly reduced.

16 MR. WESTERFIELD: Where is the
17 ingress and egress?

18 MR. SULLIVAN: It is here

19 (Indicating).

20 MR. MURPHY: Everything is at the
21 south end.

22 MR. SULLIVAN: Is at the south end.
23 There was in the very very first initial
24 proposal to The Village, we had an
25 entrance here as well that we removed long

Proceedings

1 ago. The only entrance that I alluded to
2 is this little access driveway here
3 (Indicating), we would engage it to allow
4 Metro North access to their switching
5 station.

6 MR. MURPHY: That was the question.

7 MR. SULLIVAN: That is not a
8 driveway that is connected to our
9 structure in anyway, that the residents or
10 anyone in The Village would utilize.

11 MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

12 MR. BLESSING: Is that below grade
13 on the end?

14 MR. SULLIVAN: The driveway is
15 obviously on grade.

16 MR. BLESSING: No, no, --

17 MR. SULLIVAN: This (Indicating)?

18 MR. BLESSING: Yes.

19 MR. SULLIVAN: It is partially
20 below grade and partially at the plaza
21 deck. I guess we will draw that for you
22 to explain it better, but clearly, it goes
23 below grade. But we need to have the deck
24 extend over in order to shield the lights
25 and put internal lighting in. We had it

Proceedings 60

1 outside at one time. If this was a
2 parking structure, you entered and
3 traversed that garage and you went outside
4 and then back in again. We now covered it
5 and closed it to eliminated that.

6 MR. MURPHY: There was a little
7 sidebar between my former trustee and I --
8 is it necessary, and that is probably more
9 of a legal question than a design
10 question, to provide that accessibility to
11 the railroad substation that you are
12 talking about for a second?

13 MR. STAUDT: Can one of you guys
14 answer that? Does the legal requirement
15 says of what he is asking about that or --

16 MR. MURPHY: Because we thought
17 years back, that it was not. It was --

18 MR. STAUDT: The short answer is

19 yes, and actually, if I recollect
20 correctly, aside from easements that they
21 already have, The Village was aware that
22 they were actually contemplating I
23 believe, some by condemnation if
24 necessary, widening their access. I
25 believe that's been favored as being

1 worked out between them and the developer,
2 but they have the right to it. That is a
3 short answer. In more detail to explain
4 how --

5 MR. MURPHY: They always assured us
6 that they didn't need to -- they would be
7 able to come and go by virtue of the
8 tracks, that would not have to come on the
9 property --

10 MR. STAUDT: I know from the legal
11 work at the time of the contract, that
12 they already made it clear to The Village
13 that they were going to insist --

14 MR. MURPHY: I didn't refer to
15 those who read the contract. Thank you.

16 MR. BROKER: Hello I'm Jim Broker.
17 I live in Gramatan Court which is right on
18 the other side of the Church. It's my

19 first time at one of these meetings, I
20 just moved about a year ago into the
21 complex. And I would like to say I like
22 both of these designs. They look very
23 sensitive to the environment, but I prefer
24 the one with the first one you showed for
25 a couple of reasons. I believe that the

1 taller building, even though it is set
2 back, especially if you go up the hill,
3 you will be able to see that it's taller
4 than the surrounding buildings and I think
5 the congruence with the rest of the
6 environment is something that I would go
7 for. Not that I dislike it, it's
8 certainly a good alternative to consider.
9 Another thing is all of these comments on
10 traffic are very well put, and I think the
11 full traffic assessment with some degree
12 of the idea of some how to avoid the peak
13 flows going into the same section at the
14 same time, really works while looking into
15 it. And also, the thing about -- we have
16 experienced over the last year is that the
17 area around the Church, the gathering
18 around on a Saturday night at two or

19 three o'clock in the morning for the young
20 people in Bronxville. And to add another
21 park may be, you know -- I like parks and
22 I like green spaces, and I like the green
23 space next to the Church, but there is a
24 security element already in that area that
25 we hear at two o'clock and three o'clock

1 in the morning. There should be some plan
2 in place to insure security in the park at
3 night and that should be taken into
4 consideration if you go ahead with this
5 action. Thank you.

6 MR. LATTIMER (ph): My name is Al
7 Lattimer (ph) and I'm the owner of 22
8 Sagamore Road which is an apartment
9 building catty-corner from Christ Church.
10 I'm a little bit concerned about two
11 things: First of all, the height of the
12 building that is proposed here, which
13 makes me be in favor of your first
14 presentation. I think the height of the
15 building of that nature across from 2325
16 Sagamore would not be very good looking,
17 put it that way.

18 My second concern primarily is,

19 that I don't think the garden space or the
20 green space there probably would be too
21 well used by people, except kids or people
22 that would be there at night. We get a
23 lot of kids or young people who come into
24 the Blue Moon down there and as the
25 gentleman before me just mentioned, they

1 make a lot of noise. If that park was
2 available to them, I'm sure it would be
3 and thrilling place and I'm sure they
4 would enjoy it, but I don't think it would
5 lend to the neighborhood. And those are
6 my biggest comments. I am also very
7 concerned about the parking while all the
8 construction is going on, because I have
9 twelve spaces that The Village rents to me
10 for my tenants down on Kensington and that
11 would done away with.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there
13 anybody else who wants to speak? Sir?

14 MR. LEWIS: I'm Jim Lewis
15 L-E-W-I-S, and I live at Bacum Court (ph)
16 which is just off Sagamore. The concern I
17 have is safety. There is going to be a
18 tremendous increase in traffic if this

19 project proceeds, and right now, there is
20 a lot of speeding up Sagamore Road and
21 down Sagamore road. Shouldn't The Village
22 also install say a camera which actually
23 takes pictures of vehicles that exceed the
24 speed limit? Shouldn't that be part of
25 this project? That's the question I have.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't have the
2 answer. We will note that.

3 MR. LEWIS: As you know, the park
4 which is currently on Sagamore Road --
5 many children we don't want to attract in
6 The Village.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

8 MR. WESTERFIELD: The question -- I
9 don't think the scope of this DEIS really
10 talked about the traffic impact on the
11 triangle. It talked about traffic you
12 know, in the trips in and out of the
13 project. And when you look at it now, you
14 have to do all of the ingress and egress
15 on the southern end of the property right
16 around that circle and it really is pretty
17 problematic right now. I almost had an
18 accident there. You know, the work The

19 Village did across on the other side of
20 the railroad in front of the hospital has
21 really worked out well in terms of re
22 curbing and reorienting the way
23 pedestrians can walk around it. And I
24 would think that the DEIS really needs to
25 address that and how best to mitigate

1 that. It is just going to compound into
2 more problems and you have heard that from
3 the community tonight and I hope the scope
4 includes that, because right now I don't
5 think it does.

6 MS. SMITH: Can I just add on that
7 because, I lived there at one point and
8 I've gone to that Church and all, and the
9 building is kind of peculiar with
10 Kensington being very wide at that end and
11 Kensington into Sagamore permits cars
12 going any which way as they come to that
13 intersection and I don't think -- along
14 with John that it's very paramount in all
15 of the planning that the parking -- the
16 traffic flow be addressed.

17 MR. WESTERFIELD: It may be that
18 The Village trustees also authorized some

19 sort of traffic pattern analysis as part

20 of this or something along those lines.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Sir?

22 MR. MEADE (ph): Charles Meade (ph)

23 at 51 Avon Road. First of all, I wanted

24 to compliment the architects and the

25 developers on their excellent rendering of

1 the choice they have left The Village to
2 ponder. If it's possible at this time,
3 can we sort of see both of these schemes
4 next to each other to a comparative stand
5 point? Because you have obviously seen
6 tonight there has been comment on the
7 massing about the second scheme which
8 includes the park, I'm just -- a side by
9 side comparison may be nice to see both.

10 I think one of the things that the
11 residents have talked about tonight is
12 that there does to appear to be a
13 substantial amount of massing on the
14 building scheme on the right.
15 Additionally the park has represented and
16 I think it has been voiced by several
17 people tonight who present some interest
18 in new challenges for The Village.

19 Security being one of them. And
20 additionally, I think that scheme will
21 probably tend to highlight that building
22 at the end; the medical building which is
23 fairly an architecturally insignificant
24 building.

25 Additionally, I favor scheme number

Proceedings

68

1 one from a stand point of it appears that
2 it sort of fits in with the context of the
3 building in a better manner. Sagamore
4 Road as well as Kensington, Kensington
5 sort of have a host of townhouse-like
6 structures as well as apartment buildings
7 and I think that scheme on the left much
8 more generally represents what you would
9 anticipate seeing leaving the train
10 station and heading on Kensington. As the
11 building meanders in and out, as you
12 talked about the facade, it will sort of
13 meander up and down the hill. The scheme
14 on the right from a personal stand point
15 appears to be a more significant
16 structure. One that possibly will seem
17 even out of place if not accentuated. It
18 is out of place simply and you will have

19 flat park land on both sides.

20 Again, I'm not quite sure of the

21 residents of The Village who are going to

22 use that park. It's an area that is away

23 from the shopping district, it's a

24 transient space as we all know and I

25 question whether or not there is a need

1 for that green space there? Thank you.

2 MS. LONGOBARDO: John, in scheme
3 one, this building, the doors of the
4 building that length and the length of
5 this building, aren't they about the same?

6 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

7 MS. LONGOBARDO: They are on a
8 different scale and this one looks like a
9 big helm, even though we said it stepped
10 north or south or east or west, but
11 actually, the view, except for the top two
12 stories, is the same height as the plan
13 number one, the one on the right-hand
14 side.

15 MR. MEADE (ph): I understand your
16 comment completely, but I believe the
17 architect did say they were drawn on the
18 same scale; is that correct?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, they were.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think if

21 you look at it, a side by side comparison,

22 personally, I would favor the scheme on

23 the left simply because the massing looks

24 like in more context with the land scape

25 opposed to the building on the right which

1 accentuates the idea that this is flat
2 park land. To me, it makes little sense
3 to have a park in that area and
4 additionally as I said, although they
5 minimized the medical building at the end
6 near the train tracks, the reality is you
7 are looking at sort of an ugly facade from
8 an old building that is out of context
9 with anything else and the park tends to
10 accentuate that. Thank you.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: These are very
12 useful comments, thank you. Does anybody
13 else want to stand up? Let me do this
14 because I'm just trying to get to the end
15 of this. You've got two good designs. I
16 think people are expressing that you have
17 two good choices, but I think our decision
18 is between two good choices, so I think

19 that is good. If you want to, I would be

20 very interested in --

21 MR. WESTERFIELD: Can I throw a

22 wrench in the works here?

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

24 MR. WESTERFIELD: I think we have

25 heard in the public hearing sort of five

1 to one.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to ask for a
3 show of hands from the people.

4 MR. WESTERFIELD: An informal count
5 for the two building complexes and I
6 wondered if then the right alternative to
7 look at is not the single building, but
8 the two building proposal all mission
9 style?

10 MR. BLESSING: I thought that was
11 one.

12 MS. SMITH: But we --

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the last --

14 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm not if that is
15 still an alternative in the DEIS.

16 MR. STAUDT: It's an alternative.

17 MR. BLESSING: I believe what we
18 looked at is, we had shown preference for

19 the two different styles.

20 MR. WESTERFIELD: It was sort of
21 split because the Design Review Committee
22 preferred the --

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: They are overruled.
24 I think they were out voted.

25 MR. BLESSING: Right, they were.

1 Yes.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I just do this
3 with a show of hands?

4 MR. WESTERFIELD: I think actually,
5 if you revoted, it might go the other way
6 right now.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Between the one
8 building and two buildings, if you like
9 the one building, just indulge me here.

10 (Whereupon, the audience complies.)

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: If you like the two
12 building approach with the number one
13 presented, raise your hands.

14 (Whereupon, the audience complies.)

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: If you like the one
16 building approach with the second raise
17 your hands.

18 (Whereupon, the audience complies.)

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: If you think even
20 though it is not up here, if you think you
21 might like the two building approach all
22 mission style, raise your hands.

23 (Whereupon, the audience complies.)

24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me try this
25 again. You see, there is a lower part of

1 this Tudor style and the upper building
2 which is the larger building is mission
3 style. A third alternative -- you can't
4 vote until I say so. The third
5 alternative is the whole building in
6 mission style. Before you --

7 MR. BLESSING: Two buildings.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: The two buildings is
9 mission style. Now, before you vote, keep
10 Dorothy's original comment in mind. The
11 building is the same length as the
12 Bronxville Public School. If you like the
13 building the same length as the Bronxville
14 Public School in mission style, raise your
15 hands.

16 (Whereupon, the audience complies.)

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you got two
18 votes.

19 MS. LONGOBARDO: May I introduce
20 another as the Chairman of the Design
21 Review Committee? May I introduce another
22 thought?

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything you want.

24 MS. LONGOBARDO: In other words, it
25 doesn't have to be just as long as this,

1 but you are restricted because you need
2 the light for Christ Church. So you can't
3 really start further down, but it looks as
4 even though you have gone front and back
5 very well and stepped back, and that is
6 why I asked about those patios or whatever
7 they are. It does look that it's amenable
8 more to -- maybe you can't maintain 55
9 apartments -- to some stepping down so it
10 doesn't have that -- so it looks like that
11 building more. You see that is not only
12 four stories, but it goes down to three or
13 three-and-a-half or whatever at either
14 end. So it has -- this in fact does very
15 little of that. I like the one building
16 alternative, but -- and you've done a lot
17 to having it stepped like the townhouses
18 as yet another apartment. I was wondering

19 whether more of that would make people
20 feel it isn't such a hulking thing? It
21 isn't to me -- I mean, I prefer -- because
22 I really like the idea of the park, but on
23 other hand I have a teenage granddaughter
24 that I think would like to go hang out
25 there too, so I don't know what to say

1 about that.

2 The idea of green space is
3 wonderful. On the other hand, I guess we
4 don't want young people around us that are
5 making noise and if I lived there, I
6 wouldn't either I guess. But the idea of
7 a park is Ms. McClaron (ph) here in the
8 audience has been wanting her park and
9 didn't listen all the time, but the idea
10 that you can have such a large green space
11 where there was just an ugly parking lot
12 park before, seems wonderful. Maybe it's
13 not Gramarcy park, but maybe there's a way
14 we can control it.

15 To get back to your design, I just
16 wondered -- and you said to me and I think
17 you are right, you understood whether
18 there was any preference and you didn't

19 want to spend a lot more time with it, the
20 client, I wondered if there is more of a
21 variation that would be possible to the
22 one building design? I don't know. I
23 understand you are an architect too; is
24 that right?

25 MR. MEADE (ph): If I can comment

Proceedings

76

1 on one more? There is two issues and I
2 think the first is very simple as you
3 discussed whether or not the massing is
4 correct for the site. You can look at
5 that as one issue, but the other issue is
6 what John brought up is that the buildings
7 have separate architectural styles,
8 although there is a mission influence in
9 that area, obviously, all the villages are
10 inundated with the Tudor style as well, to
11 mix them in that context sort of suggests
12 that we were confused about which way we
13 wanted to go, which we may very well be.
14 What I suggest if you want to do that, you
15 should probably stick with either the
16 Tudor or the Mission style. I sort of
17 respectfully disagree with the architect
18 when he said earlier that years from now

19 folks will think they've been here a long
20 time, I think years from today they will
21 think they made some sort of mistake. But
22 I think along those lines, that's probably
23 the greatest comment here is the park.
24 All those green spaces are clearly a
25 wonderful thing and I think we need to

1 look at the context of how they will be
2 used, who will use them and when they will
3 get used. The reality is, the railroad
4 stations are very transient spaces. If
5 you put a park down there that you hope
6 mothers and children will sit and read in,
7 I think is somewhat optimistic. More than
8 likely, as the trains rumble by -- I'm not
9 sure of what the elevation is on top of
10 the garage -- more than likely, the trains
11 rumble by on a regular basis and it might
12 become somewhat disadvantageous for us to
13 stay.

14 Additionally, green roofs on top of
15 the garages is another problem. I can
16 tell you about maintenance nightmares
17 where water infiltration and the light
18 will be a significant issue years from

19 now. So I vote scheme one.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: I feel like I want

21 to comment, but there's an awful lot

22 sitting on this. I will submit this to

23 all of you that the real fundamental

24 difference between these two alternatives

25 is not so much the design of the building.

1 Yes, that's important and yes, we are
2 trying to achieve certain sensitivities
3 towards the public right of way as well as
4 those who live here; the fundamental
5 difference is there is one building and a
6 park as opposed to two buildings and not a
7 public park --

8 MR. WESTERFIELD: One building is
9 thirteen feet taller than the other one.

10 MR. SULLIVAN: Right, I know.

11 MR. WESTERFIELD: --

12 MR. SULLIVAN: And perhaps it is,
13 but to answer Anna's question regarding --
14 if we went in that direction, can we
15 sensitize it and soften that architecture?

16 Yes. And deliver that product there in
17 that building? Probably not. Why?

18 Because I'm trying to build 110,000 square

19 feet, so clearly something has to go
20 there. Can I work on that? We will work
21 on that. Yes, we can work on that and the
22 idea is to try and bring some of this
23 tiering and desirability of that to that
24 building. We will work towards that and I
25 know we can do that. It is a bulkier

1 building.

2 MR. LONGOBARDO: Can you tier it to
3 the extent of taking off a floor? Would
4 you be able to get it down to five floors?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: I would say not. I
6 would say no, only because that area that
7 in all honesty, the developer needs to
8 retain.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.

10 MS. MCLARON (ph): John, can you
11 possibly tell us what the difference in
12 height would be? Because as I remember,
13 there are two-story garages under the two
14 buildings. And in other words, the two
15 buildings would be on top of two floors of
16 garages and the other building would just
17 be on top of one floor. And I'm thinking
18 that possibly, the height of the two

19 buildings could be as great or greater
20 than the one story building. Can you
21 straighten me out on that please?

22 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. The difference
23 in height to answer that question first is
24 this illustration that is before you here
25 (Indicating), it's fifteen feet. It might

1 be sixteen feet, if I really split the
2 hairs. But that is the two stories of
3 additional height there while they are not
4 seven-and-a-half floor heights, but
5 this --

6 MS. MCLARON: I'm sorry, I'm not --

7 MR. SULLIVAN: This building has a
8 maximum height -- it is just as -- or just
9 under fifty feet. And that is measured
10 from this plaza deck. This is a flat
11 plate which is the roof of the garage.
12 From that point up, that -- let's call it
13 fifty feet. This from that point up is
14 sixty-five feet. So that is the
15 difference in the vertical height. There
16 is no difference in the parking structure.
17 They are both starting on the same level,
18 the same flat plate which is the roof of

19 two levels of parking that are below
20 grade, within the below grade and with
21 exception of course, the entrance at the
22 south end of the site. So the garage has
23 little to do with the difference between
24 these two alternatives aesthetically
25 speaking.

1 MS. MCLARON (ph): I'd like to
2 point out that on the two-story design,
3 those buildings are right at the
4 intersection. It leaves an intersection
5 with nothing but concrete. And when they
6 were first presented, I fought very hard
7 against them. And if we could actually
8 put all that green in that intersection,
9 you will not only change the look of that
10 entire neighborhood, it would turn -- it
11 would be that much greater and added to
12 The Village. It would help the entire
13 Village. The two building plan just
14 leaves you nothing but concrete and
15 masonry in that whole area. And it's sort
16 of deadly.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me ask which
18 design does the team like? Which design

19 do you want?

20 MR. SULLIVAN: I think I will let

21 my client answer that.

22 MR. PALEY: I found the comments to

23 be very helpful informative and an example

24 of the cares the people are taking in

25 terms of how they want to see The Village

1 development. We have reached out on many
2 occasions to many of the residents of the
3 neighborhood and unfortunately, we got
4 some good residents that you heard tonight
5 -- we were hearing over the course of the
6 past several months what felt to us to be
7 a strong preference in the direction of
8 the alternative with the six-story
9 building and for many of the reasons that
10 we heard tonight.

11 When we started the process, we
12 clearly have a proposed action in mind,
13 and there are a lot of things that argue
14 in favor of that two-building scheme,
15 which you heard from John and from others
16 tonight. As we went through this process
17 and heard a number of points of view that
18 would argue in favor of one building, we

19 started to feel more comfortable with it
20 as we went along and I would like to just
21 outline a couple of our points of view on
22 that for your consideration.

23 First of all, there is a concern
24 about the construction timing and with one
25 building rather than two, there is an

1 opportunity to squeeze the construction
2 timeframe a little bit. Not
3 significantly, but, you know, it is a
4 question of several months. We also like
5 the idea of having a single building just
6 for the point of view of efficiency. One
7 elevator floor, one concierge, one point
8 of entry. From a management point of
9 view, there clearly are some advantages to
10 that. And the other aspect of course is
11 that the open space I think does relieve
12 the area in terms of creating a sense of
13 openness from an area that frankly, could
14 use the benefit from some green space.

15 There is -- we have said all along
16 that we would defer to the contentions of
17 the community as it develops over time and
18 we still feel that way, but as I said, we

19 feel that the six-story alternative does
20 have a lot of merit and when you look at
21 this comparison, it doesn't really tell
22 the whole story, because a flat
23 architectural rendering when you just see
24 the facade of the building, does not
25 really give the volumetric sense and

1 particularly, I think more importantly,
2 the sense of how to feel that pedestrians
3 scale because it tends to accentuate the
4 flatness of the building and it tends to
5 accentuate the sense of height that you
6 don't get as a pedestrian.

7 It's just something for you to
8 consider and for the residents to consider
9 that although, when you look at this side
10 by side, clearly the taller building looks
11 taller and it looks some what more
12 imposing, but the real question is when
13 you get into the neighborhood, into the
14 real context of this neighborhood, how
15 does it feel and how can you relate to it?

16 And I would suggest that the way people
17 relate to the building really at the first
18 couple levels of the building, that is

19 really where you experience it.

20 The EIS does outline and show the
21 visual impact of the two buildings and you
22 can look at that for your consideration.

23 MS. BRENNAN: May I suggest what we
24 did with Kensington Manor, in order to
25 show the people what the length of the

1 building is going to be and the height of
2 the building is going to be, we use the
3 yellow police tape to show the length of
4 one building, very ugly. We used balloons
5 on the ribbons to show how high up the
6 building would go and my concern on these
7 buildings, both of them is the height.

8 That street is only 20 feet wide,
9 Kensington Road. 20 feet, and as I said
10 to you, there is a six-foot -- not a
11 six-foot, a five-foot set back as far as
12 sidewalks go at that bottom part.

13 These are things that have to be
14 considered when putting in any kind of
15 building. This could be mammoth looking
16 on a tiny street like this if you don't do
17 it very carefully. I'm not going to
18 question your architects ability, I'm just

19 questioning the fact that this is a very
20 very unusual space to work with. And I
21 think that is something that has to be
22 considered, aside from how the
23 construction is going to affect our area.

24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it practical
25 within a short period of time to come up

1 with additional drawings rendering what
2 the building would look like in more
3 detail?

4 MR. SULLIVAN: I think that we
5 acknowledge that we need to do that
6 ourselves. Perhaps we weren't expecting
7 to get that further advanced with the
8 design, not knowing in which direction we
9 were going in, but I suppose we could have
10 a discussion about that. I certainly
11 appreciate the comments here. All of you
12 know we have shown in the past, a video
13 image that we had of this which is
14 tremendously helpful, and understanding
15 this from a more realistic perspective as
16 opposed to a flat elevation drawing. I'm
17 sure we can do that. We do not have that
18 as it is a rather costly proposition.

19 MR. WESTERFIELD: Would it be

20 possible to have a model of it?

21 MR. SULLIVAN: We have not done the

22 model, but we will build a model. But it

23 will be a model that we make of the final

24 design.

25 MR. WESTERFIELD: How about a

1 massing model?

2 MR. SULLIVAN: We can do a massing
3 model. I suppose we need to discuss these
4 things, but you are right, any other
5 mechanism that will help you and the
6 people understand these issues, and now we
7 are understanding them as the greater bulk
8 of the building, the height of the
9 building, the tiering of the building; in
10 essence, how do we minimize the bulk of
11 this in the best ability that we can and
12 the extent that I could come up with
13 whether it is a massing model or some
14 other visual that will help you understand
15 that beyond what we have here, I think we
16 can do that.

17 MS. SMITH: John, is it also
18 important to talk to the Mayor and police

19 about our park, and how successful they
20 think it will be or if it will become an
21 attractive nuisance? Because honestly, if
22 that feature turns out to be a negative,
23 that would have a lot to do with my
24 decision about a preferred style and --
25 MS. LONGOBARDO: I hadn't expected

1 that response. I could see the one
2 building, two buildings and the bulk, but
3 the idea that what I thought was an
4 attractive thing, the park, and I would
5 waiver it, I didn't want Don to take a
6 vote tonight. It looks almost like we
7 need a sociological study, not a landscape
8 architect study about whether it's such a
9 thing that can be controlled or --

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: I can speak to the
11 chief about it. I will do that. I can
12 get his view . Well, I had hoped today
13 that the consensus would help with this
14 process, but I don't see that we had one
15 -- it does seem that it looks like the two
16 building alternative is seeming to be the
17 one that the neighbors prefer.

18 MS. SMITH: Is there anything we

19 will be able to do within the next two
20 weeks to have that other meeting in
21 September?

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we
23 will have the next meeting and we will
24 just go along. I guess where we are is to
25 move to the original proposal. I don't

1 see at the moment, a consensus around an
2 alternative and maybe one will emerge as
3 we go along. It was my first choice.

4 MS. LONGOBARDO: Is the consensus
5 and the public because they're nervous
6 about the park or is it the --

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: I heard a
8 combination of the park is not a positive
9 and the one building is too high and that
10 -- which by the way is -- I didn't think
11 about the park either. I've always said
12 -- I've personally always liked the
13 original design, so that is my view, but
14 sort of willing to go along and when the
15 consensus comes around -- so the other one
16 is fine with me. I have consensus for the
17 one building --

18 MS. LONGOBARDO: I agree. As I

19 said, I thought the park was going to be a

20 positive. It turns out to be a negative.

21 I just wondered how much affect it is --

22 it's an important consideration I think --

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: But even if we did

24 have a park, it sounds to me like the

25 neighbors that came out tonight also think

1 the building is too high and prefer the
2 two lower buildings as opposed to one high
3 building, even aside from the park.

4 MS. LONGOBARDO: I understand that.
5 I guess the idea of getting height and
6 having a park -- that's why the height and
7 no one wants the park, that's what I was
8 getting at.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want
10 to make a comment that when looking at the
11 picture, when I look at the one on the
12 left, it looks like Bronxville. When I
13 look at the one on the right, I feel that
14 I'm looking at a brochure for a resort or
15 some kind of hotel-type thing. In regards
16 -- I'm also looking at the space and we
17 talked about how narrow and long it is, so
18 why aren't we using the space as it

19 exists; long and narrow?

20 One of the advantages of the first

21 scheme is that it will block the railroad

22 noise and railroad activity from the

23 residential areas. In terms of green

24 space, some of the discussions that I had

25 with Metro North people who were putting

1 up the substation, they have been telling
2 us that they were going to do some
3 landscaping and we are hoping that in
4 these tree areas, that we would get maybe
5 some kind of a park-like area developed
6 there. And the advantage there is that
7 you have homes around it. If there are
8 kids congregating, or there is anything
9 going on, the people will call the police.
10 Where as at the end of the apartment
11 building, you got people parking and
12 people over the age of 55 and then you are
13 going to leave this park area where people
14 can congregate and do whatever and it's
15 incongruous. So we started out and we
16 desperately need parking and then you are
17 putting in a park in a spot where we need
18 parking. And we need other things. There

19 are spots for parking further on down
20 Kensington and I thought that was part of
21 the Metro North --

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: I would just point
23 out that the parking is not affected. The
24 parking part will be the same. I just
25 want to make sure that is clear. The

1 building is built obviously on the ground
2 and the parking is underground, so the
3 parking that is underground would be the
4 same regardless whether there is one
5 building or two.

6 MS. CALLAHAN: Maybe you should
7 consider putting more parking up there
8 too, but I mean, it's just, you know,
9 taking a need and replacing it with
10 something else that people --

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any new
12 comments?

13 MS. CALLAHAN: This will be the
14 last comment. I know it's getting late.
15 I appreciate your idea of green space.
16 Bonnie and I actually do a lot of the
17 gardening on both Kensington and Sagamore
18 Roads and we've been doing it for years.

19 Trimming brushings, trimming stuff down
20 and, you know, our hope was to replicate
21 that area very similar and follow it up
22 through town, and I think people get hung
23 up on the idea that green space is only a
24 park, it's not. It's putting in trees and
25 plantings and adding planter beds -- and

1 number two, it is very similar to Baldwin
2 (ph) Park Florida where the architecture
3 and the space lends itself to that side of
4 a building and it is not balanced within
5 the park. I would hope that, you know, if
6 the only decision is that green space is a
7 park, it's a great idea -- that it doesn't
8 just become a stopping point because
9 again, green space is not just one spot in
10 the middle of the town or a portion of the
11 town. The green space if followed
12 through, Bronxville and Yonkers tree -- we
13 have to doctor in having like Tree USA,
14 let's follow that through on Kensington
15 Road as well as we have throughout the
16 entire Village.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I take
18 it that you are willing to go fix it and

19 go back to where you started?

20 MR. PALEY: Sure.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we kind of

22 worked you in that direction and you now

23 sort of have come to accept it, but I take

24 it that if the consensus is different,

25 you'll go back to where you started.

1 MS. LONGOBARDO: It wasn't Bobs --

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: I said we kind of
3 pushed him in that direction, but now,
4 maybe the community kind of pushed him in
5 that direction, but now maybe the
6 community kind of changed it's mind.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to
8 make one comment about the height of the
9 one story building. Even though it is six
10 stories high, the topography of the area
11 runs up hill from Kensington Road, up hill
12 to Sagamore, so the surrounding buildings
13 even though they might have fewer stories,
14 they are actually higher up on the ground,
15 because the ground slopes up. So if
16 people are concerned that it's going to
17 tower over the neighboring buildings, I
18 don't think that is actually the case.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the
20 consensus on the Board is subject to being
21 overruled here, and we are going to stick
22 with the plan as presented for the time
23 being. The two building alternative as
24 originally presented that is actually what
25 the Draft EIS sets forth as a proposal in

1 -- if there is no real consensus for some
2 other proposal, we are just going to go
3 with that for now. So we actually didn't
4 get to the definitive use that we were
5 hoping to, but that's politics.

6 MR. SACCARDI: Eventually, when you
7 close the public hearing on the DEIS, we
8 will need a definitive decision and then
9 we will draft the Final Environmental
10 Impact Statement of course.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: We are adjourned to
12 --

13 MR. STAUDT: You need to make a
14 motion to adjourn the public hearing to a
15 date and time.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: I would entertain a
17 motion to adjourn both public hearings
18 until September 28th at 7:30 p.m. Is there

19 a second?

20 MR. WESTERFIELD: Second.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

22 (Whereupon, the Board voted

23 unanimately in favor.)

24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

25 (Time noted 10:34 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

CERTIFICATION

Certified to be a true and accurate
transcript of the aforesaid proceeding.

Tina E. Dinunzio

19

20

21

22

23

24

25