

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 28, 2005  
8:00 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 - NOT PRESENT

6 ERIC BLESSING

RICHARD CAREY

7

OTHER BRONXVILLE OFFICIALS

8

MARYANN PALERMO - NOT PRESENT

9 JAMES STAUDT - SPECIAL COUNSEL

VINCENT PICI - TOWN ENGINEER

10 MARILYN TIMPONE MOHAMED - NOT PRESENT

LYDIA BYRNE - SECRETARY

11

SPECTRUM KENSINGTON LLC - PROJECT TEAM

12

BOB PALEY

13 JOHN SACCARDI

NINA PEEK

14 JOHN COLLINS

JOHN SULLIVAN

15 KEVIN MCMANUS

16 VENEZIANO & ASSOCIATES

Attorneys for the applicant Spectrum Kensington LLC

17 84 Business Park Drive

Suite 200

18 Armonk, New York 10504

BY: MARK MILLER, ESQ.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings 3

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: The next and final  
2 regular order of business here is the  
3 continuation of the Kensington Road  
4 application. And just to also review  
5 where we are on that, at the last meeting,  
6 we opened the public hearing on the Draft  
7 Environmental Impact Statement. We  
8 focused primarily on the design of the  
9 building. On the table is the design that  
10 is set forth, as the primary design in the  
11 Draft Environmental Impact Statement,  
12 which is two buildings with two styles;  
13 one Tudor and one Mission Style.

14 One alternative that some members  
15 of the audience expressed a favor for one,  
16 was to have the two buildings all in the  
17 Mission style. And another alternative is  
18 to have one larger building all in the

19 Mission style and have a park-like area  
20 where the Tudor style building would be in  
21 the original application.

22 So we are going to continue that  
23 discussion and then in addition, we are  
24 going to start actually looking at the  
25 text of the DEIS, and again, as far as we

Proceedings 4

1 can get tonight, depending on the time.  
2 Hopefully we can get through at least half  
3 of that and the community can make some  
4 progress on it.

5 I've asked the applicant to come  
6 back and address again this style of the  
7 building. I think they wanted to address  
8 again the alternative design of having one  
9 building with a park area and then I've  
10 asked them also if they could, if they  
11 have the boards to show what the one  
12 building Mission style would like -- two  
13 building Mission style.

14 MR. MILLER: Good evening Mr.  
15 Chairmen, Members of the Board. My name is  
16 Mark Miller, I'm from the Law Firm of  
17 Veneziano & Associates, counsel for the  
18 applicants, WCI. Most of my notes just

19 got covered by the Chairman, so I will be

20 even briefer than I intended to be.

21 As the Chairman indicated, we are

22 here tonight on a continuation of actually

23 two public hearings. One with respect to

24 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

25 and the other with respect to the Site

Proceedings

1 Plan.

2 As the Chairman indicated, we would  
3 like to cover some more ground tonight  
4 with respect to the six-story alternative,  
5 and here with me tonight to speak will be  
6 Kevin McManus from WCI, who I'm sure most  
7 of you remember earlier on in this  
8 project. Kevin will talk about some of  
9 the history of the project and how it came  
10 to be where we are today. John Sullivan,  
11 our Project Architect, who spoke two weeks  
12 ago will discuss the design issues. John  
13 Saccardi, from Saccardi and Shiff, our  
14 Planner, will talk about comparative  
15 impacts between the four-story alternative  
16 and the six-story alternative. And Bob  
17 Paley, also from WCI, will talk about  
18 various marketing and business issues.

19           For anyone who wasn't here two  
20           weeks ago, if I might just give you a  
21           brief summary of how the Environmental  
22           Impact process works here in New York, we  
23           are here tonight as the Chairman  
24           indicated, with respect to the Draft  
25           Environmental Impact Statement. It is a

Proceedings

6

1 document that our project team prepared to  
2 address all of the various environmental  
3 impacts that were identified by the  
4 Planning Board and its professional  
5 consultants. And what we are here to do  
6 tonight is to receive any comments from  
7 any members of the public, and of course  
8 the Planning Board acting as the lead  
9 agency on that document.

10 We have a stenographer here to take  
11 down verbatim what everybody says, so I  
12 will remind anybody who speaks to please  
13 state your name clearly so the  
14 stenographer can get it down.

15 All of the comments that were  
16 received last week, and that are received  
17 tonight, they will come in written form,  
18 and will be compiled into the various

19 topics and they will form the subject for  
20 the Final Environmental Impact Statement.  
21 Which essentially is, it is almost like a  
22 Q and A. All the questions raised by the  
23 public and the Board are the questions  
24 that will be presented in the Final  
25 Environmental Impact Statement, and that

Proceedings

1 document will provide answers to each and  
2 every question that is raised.

3 In addition to the oral comments we  
4 received last week and will receive  
5 tonight, as I indicated, there is also the  
6 opportunity for written comments. Since  
7 our last meeting, we have in fact received  
8 several written letters and I assume the  
9 Planning Board has seen them. The MTA has  
10 commented, Westchester County, one of  
11 project neighbors, and it's entirely  
12 probable that we will be receiving  
13 additional letters as well.

14 As the Chairman indicated, we hoped  
15 to hear from the Board tonight as well as  
16 the members of public, and we are all  
17 looking forward to moving this project  
18 forward and to that extent, we hope to

19 cover as much ground as possible tonight  
20 on both design issues, as well as other  
21 substantive issues. And to the extent  
22 that we can complete that review, we will  
23 look to close the public hearing on the  
24 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We  
25 recognize and we discussed with counsel,

Proceedings 8

1 the fact that the public hearing on the  
2 Site Plan will remain open as that is an  
3 on-going process, but in order for to us  
4 move forward, we have to close the hearing  
5 on the Draft Environmental Impact  
6 Statement because that then triggers a  
7 written comment period and when that is  
8 closed, that enables us then to prepare  
9 the FEIS and continue the process.

10 So with that, and with the Board's  
11 permission, I would like to have Kevin  
12 McManus talk about the history of the  
13 project. Thank you.

14 MR. MCMANUS: Good evening, Mr.  
15 Chairman, Members of the Planning Board, I  
16 will be very very brief. And it's less of  
17 a historical perspective as it is more of  
18 just putting it into the record, and I

19 think it is important to do so, the origin  
20 of the six-story alternative. Prior to  
21 John Sullivan proceeding with a discussion  
22 of the design parameters, I thought it  
23 would be worthwhile to see how we think  
24 we've been successful in tying in some of  
25 the issues that were raised.

Proceedings

1           The alternative that you are going  
2           to see in a few minutes was not conceived  
3           in a vacuum. It was actually -- if you  
4           recall, after one or several of the prior  
5           meetings that we've had here where  
6           discussions, lengthy discussions on  
7           architecture were knocked about, we  
8           received telephone calls from some  
9           community members probably about a year  
10          ago, in late October of 2004, and over the  
11          following several months afterwards, six  
12          or seven months, had a series of meetings  
13          with the groups that included as many as  
14          three and sometimes ten people in a room,  
15          talking about issues and how we could  
16          possibly modify our design to address  
17          serious concerns that they had about our  
18          proposal. We came up with an alternative

19 plan.

20 I would point out that not a  
21 single one of the people that we met with,  
22 ever presented to us that they thought  
23 there was any reason not to developed the  
24 site. That they felt if done  
25 appropriately, that it would certainly be

Proceedings

1 an improvement to the community as a  
2 whole.

3 As I point out just some basic  
4 points that were made by the community and  
5 some of issues that were addressed -- some  
6 by the way, we couldn't even address  
7 because they ended up being a direct  
8 conflict with contractual obligations  
9 that we have with the Village. For  
10 instance, providing a minimum of 200  
11 spaces of parking to the Village. But  
12 there were issues that were raised about  
13 the need that really any good land plan  
14 should provide a meaningful open space.  
15 That any good land plan should provide  
16 particularly, with the amount of concrete  
17 and pavement in that area, the ability to  
18 provide more green space in order to

19 provide shade and it also provides a break

20 in the structure and the pavement area.

21 That there was a need to reduce the

22 feel of what could be perceived as a

23 cavern appearance along Kensington Road,

24 of the string of two buildings along the

25 entire length of our property. And a

1 four-story building that would be  
2 four-stories, but that was accentuated by  
3 the fact that as we've been through a  
4 dozen times, the parking garage doesn't  
5 become a sub service parking garage at  
6 either end due to the topography, so we  
7 have as much as a story parking garage  
8 that is exposed on the south end and north  
9 ends of the site.

10 It was felt that the garage access  
11 being placed at the southern end of this  
12 building and then a structure placed on  
13 top of the garage, accelerated that height  
14 and that feeling of a lack of proportion  
15 with Kensington Road and that location.

16 We spent several months addressing  
17 these issues. We were encouraged to think  
18 out of the box. We were encouraged to

19           press the envelope, and we were encouraged  
20           to provide a real alternative as opposed  
21           to something that would merely satisfy the  
22           SEQRA. That if we were able to come up  
23           with a real alternative and address these  
24           needs, that we would be able to present a  
25           plan that showed our commitment to being

Proceedings

1 responsive to the community.

2 We think we succeeded with this and

3 we think to a large extent that there are

4 several people who believe that the

5 alternative is the preferred alternative.

6 I think that we are among those people.

7 WCI Spectrum is among that group that

8 potentially feels that this alternative is

9 really the preferred alternative design.

10 We were by the way, encouraged by a

11 Mayor, the Village Board, to continue with

12 these meetings. And so they were

13 certainly made aware of the discussions

14 that we were having with the community.

15 So I just wanted to put that in context

16 before John proceeds with the discussion.

17 It was not a plan that got conceived in

18 our conference room. Thank you.

19 MR. SULLIVAN: Good evening Mr.  
20 Chairman, Members of the Board, how are  
21 you tonight? Good to see you again. Two  
22 weeks ago we were here and had a  
23 discussion and presentation looking at the  
24 preferred Action Plan and then  
25 specifically, was identified in the DEIS

1 as a scheme path as an alternative to  
2 further -- that Kevin just alluded to,  
3 explained that particular alternative. I  
4 believe that tonight at your  
5 recommendation of suggestion Mr. Chairman,  
6 that we look at that alternative further  
7 and I have additional graphics and  
8 information that perhaps can help explain  
9 that proposal and that we simply finalize  
10 my discussion presentation to that.

11 (Whereupon, a presentation was made  
12 to the Board.)

13 So these drawings are a bit  
14 haggard, perhaps we should have these  
15 mounted one of these days and I will do  
16 that so we look a bit more professional at  
17 our next discussion. This is drawing that  
18 we looked at two weeks ago. This is that

19           Scheme F as an alternative in the DEIS and  
20           it specifically addresses an elevation  
21           which is shown at the top, as well as a  
22           plan that is shown in the center. Is that  
23           legible? I will rotate that and it's  
24           obviously one drawing and it is difficult  
25           for the Board to see. For the purpose of

1 those who are sitting in the audience as  
2 well as the Board, I think the general  
3 operation of the audio visual can --

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think there is a  
5 pointer up there John.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: And I have one as  
7 well. So maybe I will pull this around  
8 here (Indicating). So what we have here  
9 is, this is known as 1 Pondfield Road, the  
10 small medical building. And this is  
11 clearly the proposal for -- in essence, a  
12 six-story structure that would sit atop  
13 the parking garage which is no different  
14 in either of these schemes as we have  
15 previously discussed.

16 That parking level is a comparison  
17 if you would, between the proposed Action  
18 Plan, the original proposal with the

19 Village, and this as frankly as other  
20 alternatives, is that the parking levels  
21 and that plaza level are the same. It is  
22 all about what sits on top of that. And  
23 in this case, we see from the elevation  
24 here as well as the Plan, that this  
25 represents the footprint of that building.

1 And as it's been identified that the  
2 southerly portion of this site,  
3 approximately half that site, as we know,  
4 from 1 Pondfield Road to this point here  
5 (Indicating), the affective useable area  
6 of the site for construction development  
7 purposes, is 625 by 100 feet. That has  
8 not changed. That northerly triangular  
9 piece of property will remain as open  
10 space and it would be landscaped. And  
11 just to clarify, it has an access drive  
12 providing vehicle access to the MTA  
13 switching building here on their property.

14 So what we are looking at is  
15 comparing in essence, is this building and  
16 this footprint and this height here  
17 (Indicating) and offering an open space as  
18 Kevin alluded to. This area at this

19 portion of the site previously was  
20 occupied by another four-story building,  
21 so the opportunity that is gained here,  
22 really is as much on site as it is  
23 offsite, and I think that is what is in  
24 essence, the genesis of what drove us  
25 towards looking at a one design

Proceedings

1 alternative.

2 I will speak about the building in  
3 a moment, but for this moment I would like  
4 to just look at the opportunity that  
5 exists as this being an open space. A  
6 park, a privately held and publically  
7 accessed park. I will talk about that in  
8 a moment as well.

9 MS. LONGOBARDO: Could you just  
10 clarify something? The two building  
11 alternate, they were not equal in length;  
12 is that right? They were not -- in other  
13 words, what it shows here is that we know  
14 that we went over the measurements when  
15 you were presenting it to the designers,  
16 the park would be 250 feet long,  
17 approximately.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct.

19 MS. LONGOBARDO: And if we take the  
20 middle portion which is more or less stays  
21 the same, therefore, does that mean the  
22 two parts of the building were not the  
23 same length to start with, the two  
24 building alternative?

25 MR. SULLIVAN: The two building

Proceedings 17

1 alternative that is in essence, the  
2 southerly building --

3 MS. LONGOBARDO: Yes.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct. Was in the  
5 area where we are proposing to construct  
6 this open space/park. The center area,  
7 that Piazza as I called it in the past, is  
8 at the same location.

9 MS. LONGOBARDO: The length of the  
10 park is around 250 --

11 MR. SULLIVAN: The length of that  
12 park is around 250 feet by 100 feet.

13 MS. LONGOBARDO: And that was the  
14 length of the building --

15 MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct.

16 MS. LONGOBARDO: Is the length of  
17 the building in the project design?

18 MR. SULLIVAN: In the proposed

19 Action Plan; that is correct.

20 MS. LONGOBARDO: Right. And the

21 building we are looking at is about

22 250 feet for the one building alternative,

23 is that also 250 feet?

24 MR. SULLIVAN: It is probably about

25 300 feet because that is 250 and this is

1 probably about -- this is about 75 feet.

2 It's about 75 feet, 250 feet and

3 approximately 300 feet.

4 MS. LONGOBARDO: That is the point

5 I was trying to make. That is why it

6 looks different in -- because it is in

7 fact longer than the building.

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. And the actual

9 footprint of this building, in comparison

10 to the previous building proposal, are not

11 exactly the same. They are suttally

12 different. There are -- we still retain

13 the horizontal off sets and undulations

14 across the front of the property as it

15 fronts the sidewalk along Kensington, so

16 that we create these ins and outs and not

17 a flat facade along there. Be it all,

18 that they may be slightly smaller than

19 what the original plan was.

20 MS. LONGOBARDO: I didn't mean to

21 stop your train of thought, it's just

22 that when you look at that, it certainly

23 doesn't look like two halves of a building

24 that are about the same length. If you

25 look at two, your bottom drawing -- so in

1 fact, the one half is somewhat shorter and  
2 the other is somewhat longer. So the  
3 building above, the one building  
4 alternative, does look and is in fact  
5 longer than the second half would have  
6 been. I don't -- I'm sorry that -- I just  
7 needed to -- it looks that way to me, but  
8 it is in fact the way it is.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: It is slightly  
10 longer, but I'm talking about 25 or  
11 30 feet. That's all it is longer. Maybe  
12 why it looks larger is clearly because  
13 there are two additional floors on that  
14 building.

15 MS. LONGOBARDO: I was looking at  
16 the plan.

17 MR. SULLIVAN: At the plan? It's  
18 really not that much longer. It's only

19            maybe 25 feet and it's in this area right  
20            here (Indicating). It starts at the same  
21            spot and in fact, it may even look that  
22            way because this portion of the building  
23            right here (Indicating) from the previous  
24            plan, these buildings were stepped back a  
25            little bit further about where the pointer

Proceedings 20

1 is, and that they are out further. So it  
2 maybe gives a representation of it being  
3 slightly larger in the footprint.

4 We can get into the facts on this,  
5 but this and the original are the same  
6 building areas by the way. This is not  
7 larger in asking for more development  
8 area, it's only 10,000 square feet in one  
9 building as opposed to two buildings. So  
10 it is not -- it is larger in that sense.

11 It's higher and maybe squared off is some  
12 areas, but in favor of that space at the  
13 southern end of the park, perhaps what is  
14 even more compelling, is that the  
15 rendering here or the photograph montage  
16 as we referred to it as, is an actual  
17 photograph. Is that visible by all of  
18 you?

19                    Obviously you can tell that is a  
20                    photograph taken I believe earlier this  
21                    year or perhaps even in the fall of last  
22                    year. Looking up Kensington, literally  
23                    standing at the high point of Kensington  
24                    looking north. You can see the building  
25                    adjacent to Christ Church on the right and

Proceedings 21

1 then the additional structure beyond it.  
2 But you can see that is the proposed  
3 Action Plan building. It's four stories  
4 as has shown in the pedestrian space --  
5 the pedestrian experience, those who are  
6 walking along Kensington on this side,  
7 even that side along the opposite side of  
8 street you see a one, two, three,  
9 four-story building. This plan sees the  
10 same.

11 While we've added two flights in  
12 from the previous building to this  
13 building, we wanted to design this  
14 building to maintain that elevation and  
15 that height as a street scape. And I  
16 think that is really important to  
17 understand. It is further important to  
18 explain --

19 MS. LONGOBARDO: That is because of  
20 the set backs of the two top stories?

21 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct.  
22 And that is what this right here shows  
23 (Indicating).

24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it your view that  
25 even on the other side of the street, one

1 would only perceive a four-story building?

2 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct, and

3 you can see that from this right here

4 (Indicating). This is a section cut

5 across and this is an elevation of the

6 side of Christ Church with its steeple,

7 cut across this is Kensington Road, cut

8 through the site 100 feet, the train

9 tracks and a slight representation of the

10 buildings over end and at stone. This is

11 the plaza right here. We will call it

12 that. One, two levels of parking below

13 grade as they confront the high point of

14 Kensington Road. One, two, three, four,

15 five, six, stories. You can faintly see

16 that line drawn here, that is the

17 four-story portion of the building and how

18 we have stepped back these buildings. You

19 can see it. This is the site elevation as  
20 we will cut right through the center of  
21 the site where the plaza, where the drive  
22 court is. You can see the same thing is  
23 represented still here in two-story, a  
24 three-story, a four-story, five, six, the  
25 upper floors of the building are stepped

1 back.

2 While we have not 100 percent  
3 refined this design, that is the concept  
4 that we are going to continue to try to  
5 employ in the final design. The idea is  
6 that these upper two floors are in essence  
7 penthouses as we may all know them, and  
8 they have roof terraces. There is  
9 tremendous opportunity which is why the  
10 developer likes this concept. Why we like  
11 the concept is opportunity to create  
12 valuable living space. Valuable living  
13 space not only up here, but by what we  
14 gain here (Indicating). We no longer have  
15 a building that is 25 feet away from the  
16 north wall at 1 Pondfield Road, we now  
17 have people looking down on this space  
18 that we are looking at as well.

19           As valuable as this space becomes  
20           for the public for off site as well as for  
21           their use, it is equally as valuable for  
22           those that exist here. What are we doing?  
23           We are creating a better development,  
24           improved lifestyle, and improve the  
25           quality of life for those who live here as

1 well as off site.

2 I have a few other illustrations  
3 that I want to show you. Many of these  
4 are in the DEIS. We simply took them and  
5 enlarged them for all of our purposes, but  
6 it draws attention -- this is again, the  
7 photograph that we took when members of my  
8 staff, from the train platform at the  
9 train station looking north. We all see  
10 the 1 Pondfield Road which I would like to  
11 do the facade of that building. In guess  
12 that's another day. Anyway, you can see  
13 that here is the steeple beyond Christ  
14 Church, here is our building beyond.

15 It gives a sense of perspective, a  
16 sense of scale; again, from what's  
17 meaningful from a pedestrians eye, from a  
18 pedestrians scale.

19           Another photograph montage. This  
20           you have not seen. This is not in the  
21           DEIS, although we have this photograph  
22           taken from in front of the restaurant  
23           across from this -- right here we see the  
24           corner of 1 Pondfield Road (Indicating).  
25           Here is the entrance to the parking

Proceedings 25

1 structure, the building beyond, the scale  
2 of the tress that we hope that we will  
3 plant here. You get a sense from that  
4 important point of what this space will  
5 look like without the presence of a  
6 building right here. It opens up that  
7 corner. I think in my opinion, that's  
8 very much which is at the heart of many of  
9 the people who have asked for this  
10 alternative; is not to have that building  
11 facing right there (Indicating). That  
12 type of visual I think helps understand  
13 that.

14 MS. LONGOBARDO: It would have been  
15 great John, if you have the equivalent to  
16 the four-story building all 25 feet away  
17 from -- do you know what I mean?

18 MR. SULLIVAN: You are right, and

19           you know what? If you like, I will have

20           that next time.

21                   MS. LONGOBARDO: I think it would

22           be useful.

23                   MR. SULLIVAN: I will have it next

24           time.

25                   MS. LONGOBARDO: It looks nice to

1 see it open, I don't know how un open it

2 looks with --

3 MS. SULLIVAN: But in the short two

4 weeks, you know -- we will --

5 MS. LONGOBARDO: It is not a

6 criticism.

7 MR. SULLIVAN: I understand and

8 that is a very fair request and I think we

9 can do that. I also have this -- this is

10 also in the DEIS. We blew it up larger

11 for all of you as well, because it begins

12 to illustrate where there are other

13 buildings that are in the immediate

14 context certainly of this site that are

15 six-stories or larger. And I will share

16 with you that one of those is that

17 building right there (Indicating). As

18 many times as I've been here, as many

19 times as I've stood at this site, I never  
20 realized that that facade that faced  
21 Kensington is a seven-story building.  
22 Seven stories. And that is a photograph  
23 taken from that parking lot, and it's  
24 right there (Indicating). One, two,  
25 three, four, five, six, seven, no, maybe I

1 missed one. One, two, three, four, five  
2 six, seven. We have structures that are  
3 immediately adjacent to this site that are  
4 if not comparable, perhaps higher than the  
5 building that we are looking at as a  
6 comparison here. So in context, it is not  
7 like the proposal is suggesting putting in  
8 a six-story building in the middle of a  
9 context of three, four-story structures,  
10 we are in a context that has similar  
11 building heights.

12 Let's just get back to this  
13 building for a moment (Indicating). It is  
14 our goal to design this building and while  
15 this is a concept in elevation, and one by  
16 the way, as you can all see that we have  
17 paid attention to, not just in terms of  
18 facade, but these facades actually

19 represent unit plans where there is  
20 circulation, where cores of the building  
21 are; there is some thought behind that.

22 That building and its components  
23 and it's important features, the Juliet  
24 balconies, that all of the details that  
25 work within the Mission style is our goal

1 to bring to the final design and we will  
2 not compromise on that. We will not  
3 compromise.

4 This is not about making a simpler  
5 building if compared to two more elaborate  
6 buildings, this is about making a better  
7 building. And we will do that and we need  
8 to spend more time at this, but we believe  
9 that we are creating the same street  
10 scape, the same pedestrian experience as  
11 we looked at a moment ago in terms of  
12 those who walk and drive on Kensington.  
13 They will see the same details, the same  
14 level of attention given to detail, and as  
15 we've had in our previous plans, from a  
16 design perspective, focus is driven very  
17 much the same, and what do we gain? We  
18 gain this space which becomes privately

19 controlled with public access.

20 We discussed last time, how would

21 we do that? The Home Owner's Association

22 is part of this approval and will control

23 the access to that site. What do I mean

24 by that? It may be open from eight in the

25 morning to eight at night. Those are not

1 fixed hours, but we can -- with a gated  
2 community in a sense, that there has  
3 always has been a gate, a vehicle entrance  
4 gate into the plaza; still stays. There  
5 has always been a fence along Kensington  
6 for safety reasons I might add, because of  
7 -- some have fallen off that, but it at  
8 the same time, we can control those who  
9 use that space and the hours of its  
10 operation in conjunction with the Village  
11 and how we want to control that.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: How high will this  
13 fence be along the road?

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Three feet. It's  
15 three feet at this point (Indicating). It  
16 is a three-foot fence so that when you are  
17 standing here, you know -- but at this  
18 point from about here to about that point

19 (Indicating), it is about three feet. As  
20 we all know and we have discussed this  
21 before, Kensington goes down hill. We  
22 have our entrance to the garage here which  
23 we see right there (Indicating), that that  
24 point of entrance is probably about eight  
25 feet from the plaza deck down to the

Proceedings 30

1 sidewalk.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: How high is the  
3 elevation at the lowest point along the  
4 park area; do you know?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: It's that point  
6 right there where you enter the garage  
7 (Indicating). When you say lowest, you  
8 mean from the sidewalk up to that?

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

10 MS. LONGOBARDO: It's like a story,  
11 right?

12 MR. SULLIVAN: It's like a story.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Kensington goes up,  
14 that elevation has to be lower if you go  
15 north; would it not be?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Is that grade. The  
17 high point of Kensington right here  
18 (Indicating), is that grade and that plaza

19 connects, that's how you drive on this.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: So one standing

21 there is confronted by a three-foot fence?

22 MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Where would

24 the gate be to the entrance?

25 MR. SULLIVAN: It is at the vehicle

1 entrance right here (Indicating). The  
2 high point of Kensington, you drive in on  
3 grade level with that plaza and it is  
4 level. There is a gate at the point so a  
5 vehicle can pull in, not block traffic,  
6 and be able to get access to that space.

7 The pedestrians who are walking  
8 would have a gate perhaps in the same spot  
9 and be on grade and walk right in here  
10 (Indicating). This is a completely  
11 handicapped accessible space.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what I'm  
13 trying to get at is at 10 o'clock at  
14 night, what will prevent one from walking  
15 into that parking area?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Besides from the  
17 gate that is closed, a 24-hour concierge  
18 service that is part of this building.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: But the gate though

20 is to the entrance to the top of the plaza

21 area?

22 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Then people coming

24 by car, they won't have access to it after

25 ten at night?

Proceedings

1 MR. SULLIVAN: No, they will not.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: I see.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: Unless we change

4 that. If you are asking for example,

5 would a commuter be able to have access to

6 this space, the answer would be perhaps by

7 pulling in here (Indicating), and having a

8 concierge open that up and allowing them

9 access.

10 THE COURT: What will the gate look

11 like?

12 MR. SULLIVAN: We haven't gotten to

13 that yet Mr. Chairman, but it is a simple

14 retracting gate. I don't think -- to

15 answer your question honestly, I don't

16 know. We haven't designed it, but

17 something that's commensurate with the

18 ramming that surrounds it.

19           MR. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the  
20           question -- I think it was a comment from  
21           the last meeting, that I think the  
22           question is, at 10 o'clock at night, what  
23           will stop three 16-year olds from getting  
24           into that area?

25           MR. SULLIVAN: The Pit bull that is

Proceedings

1 leashed up.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Then that is a good  
3 answer.

4 MR. PALEY: Bob Paley, WCI  
5 Communities. We heard the concerns last  
6 week about the issue of security, and I  
7 would just say that in my experience in  
8 having dealt with many many plazas and  
9 publically accessible private spaces  
10 throughout this region, there are several  
11 factors you need to consider in terms of  
12 design and management. And those are the  
13 things that we haven't yet designed, but  
14 clearly, they are on the table for  
15 discussion about how we plan to maintain  
16 the security. First is gating it so that  
17 it is a clearly controlled space and that  
18 access at night is locked and closed, so

19 people would not have access to it. And  
20 second, is site lines to make sure that  
21 the concierge is there 24-hours a day, has  
22 visibility into the site and they have  
23 good site lines throughout the plaza area.

24 Third, is lighting. Making sure  
25 that you have appropriate levels of

## Proceedings

34

1 lighting so that it feels like it is not a  
2 deserted space. Clearly, it is a well-lit  
3 attractive space. Then from a management  
4 point of view, clearly you have to have a  
5 monitor which we will have in the building  
6 and also, you have to make sure that it is  
7 maintained so that it really is a  
8 cared-for space.

9 Now given the fact that this is the  
10 front door to the building and the front  
11 yard of the building, as the developer of  
12 the building, there is clearly no way we  
13 will tolerate that the security would be  
14 in any way compromised. And just so you  
15 know, there was a mention of touching base  
16 with Police Chief Downey, which I did  
17 after the meeting, and reviewed these  
18 concepts with him. And he was completely

19 comfortable with this concept of the  
20 plaza, given the design parameter that we  
21 just discussed and the monitoring of the  
22 space. And clearly, should we go in this  
23 direction, we would obviously review all  
24 details with you, work the details about  
25 the look of the fence, how high it is,

1 type of access and we would sit down with  
2 the Police Chief as well to review those  
3 issues.

4 I think that the security issue is  
5 one that is just coming at us and talking  
6 about it as a park, as a public park, I  
7 think raised concerns among many people  
8 who heard the context for the first time,  
9 but clearly the idea here is that this is  
10 the front door for the building and it is  
11 a space that is privately controlled and  
12 privately maintained, but yet, it is  
13 accessible to the public. It is an  
14 amenity to the public, it is operated at  
15 the entrance of the building, so somebody  
16 coming down Kensington will have full  
17 access during the hours of operation and  
18 really, it has the best of both worlds.

19 MS. LONGOBARDO: I am curious about  
20 something. I was thinking we are so hard  
21 on Midland Gardens and their parking and  
22 their lots of open space around and they  
23 are opposite St. Joseph's Church, they got  
24 that space and -- somehow, that doesn't  
25 seem to be a popular gathering spot for

1 all our pre-teens and teenagers. And I  
2 was concerned and we had this discussion  
3 with Mr. Paley at our Design Review  
4 Committee meeting and we asked about,  
5 would this be a place for teenagers to  
6 congregate and so on? And he said it  
7 would be dealt with. It came up loud and  
8 clear during the Planning Board portion of  
9 this. We do have other alternate spaces  
10 and they seemed -- our own kids do seem to  
11 congregate in one place or another, and  
12 the school field et cetera, but I think a  
13 park right at the foot of a magnificent  
14 building isn't necessarily -- I mean it's  
15 like a Charles Adams picture with a black  
16 wrought iron fence so all of these kids  
17 would be waiting to jump over or  
18 something, so we have open places without

19 fences that nobody uses.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the Chief

21 gave me some insight into it. He said --

22 I was going to report later, but I have

23 the opportunity now. He said that there

24 have been problems along Kensington Road

25 that were reported, particularly during

1 the summer and they had quite a number of  
2 complaints from people of the residents  
3 there of teenagers congregating on  
4 Sagamore Park and other places. He also  
5 said that as all of us have been teenagers  
6 at one time, that the teenagers tend to go  
7 to some place where they are not readily  
8 visible to the police driving by, so I  
9 think if you have like that area that you  
10 are referring to near St. Joseph's Church,  
11 it is an open area and if the police drive  
12 down the street, they are going to see it  
13 and he said this property is elevated and  
14 he said if there are parts of it that are  
15 not visible while patrol cars are coming  
16 down Kensington or going up Kensington,  
17 that would likely be a favorable place for  
18 the teenagers to go.

19 He also said -- by the way, he also  
20 pointed out that this is private property  
21 and he said the police have no  
22 jurisdiction over the park because it is  
23 private property. And they have no  
24 jurisdiction to go on to the property  
25 unless they are invited on by the owner.

Proceedings

1 So they -- if the owner calls the police  
2 and said there are teenagers drinking beer  
3 in the park, would you come and get them  
4 out? They can come do that. But it is  
5 officially closed at 8 o'clock and you are  
6 driving down Kensington at this time and  
7 the concierge does not call and complain,  
8 they don't have any authority to go on the  
9 premises and say this area is closed  
10 because it is private property.

11 He did say however, I think what  
12 Bob is reporting, that if it is locked --  
13 and that is why I was questioning -- the  
14 lock to me might have a different meaning  
15 than a lock to my son who can jump over  
16 stuff, you know. I was questioning how is  
17 it going to be secured? He did say that  
18 it was secured, and he also said teenagers

19           jump over stuff. You say you got a  
20           ten-foot fence, they climb over a ten-foot  
21           fence. But it is relatively secured and  
22           lit, and he said this is a crucial part,  
23           and it is monitored by the owners of the  
24           building, and they go out every once in a  
25           while and look and see who is in there and

1 write off whoever is in there. Then he  
2 says he thought this would be fine. Those  
3 were his conclusions. We got you way off  
4 track, but I think it was an important  
5 diversion, because I think that is a  
6 crucial and a key point in this design.

7 MR. PALEY: I think we will go back  
8 to the order that we are going to let John  
9 Saccardi come up and talk about some of  
10 the EIS issues, and I will be back just  
11 briefly to talk about some of our  
12 marketing.

13 MR. SACCARDI: John Saccardi from  
14 Saccardi and Shiff. Good eveing  
15 Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, and  
16 everyone in the public as well. Since we  
17 are in the Environmental Impact Statement  
18 process, I thought it might be helpful to

19 take a look at the same issues in a  
20 six-story versus the two four-story  
21 buildings, in a bit of context of what we  
22 are doing with the Environmental Impact  
23 Statement. And the chart that is before  
24 you summarizes about a dozen different  
25 issues from the Environmental Impact

Proceedings 40

1 Statement. Essentially, in the same order  
2 as in the EIS. Covering some of the  
3 filling points about the difference  
4 between two four-story buildings and one  
5 six-story building with a half-acre of  
6 open space plaza. The way this chart is  
7 organized, I think everybody can  
8 understand. The columns are talking about  
9 the different categories of the EIS  
10 chapters. Across the first is a two  
11 four-story building and then the one  
12 six-story building. We have extra copies  
13 for the Design Board.

14 I can go through this pretty  
15 quickly, because I think a lot of the  
16 points were already raised. First in  
17 terms of land use. Certainly, the two  
18 four-story buildings are compatible with

19 the land uses in the surrounding area.

20 The six-story building is also compatible,

21 but the point there and it is really maybe

22 perhaps an urban planning point of view,

23 but having an open space plaza park in the

24 center of the Village is a very important

25 land use concept that the six-story

1 alternative would bring to the Village of  
2 Bronxville.

3 From the zoning point of view, the  
4 second row across, the development that we  
5 are proposing would be permitted by a  
6 special permit in the Residence D  
7 District, and that is a specific zoning  
8 amendment that we are offering as part of  
9 the Environmental Impact Statement  
10 process.

11 If we went with the six-story  
12 alternative, that amendment would have to  
13 be modified. However, it is important to  
14 the note that the Residence D already  
15 allows for a six-story building, so our  
16 proposal was for age-targeted housing with  
17 a four-story building. We would have to  
18 amend that age-targeted housing with a

19 six-story building, but you already do in  
20 fact allow six-story buildings in the  
21 Residence D zone.

22 The comparison and statistical  
23 terms of the open space that is provided,  
24 with the plan that John showed with the  
25 two four-story buildings, we had about

1 7000 square feet that was the plaza area  
2 where in front of the two buildings  
3 between the two building and about 1,000  
4 square feet of other green space with the  
5 two four-story buildings compared to the  
6 20,000 square foot landscaped plaza that  
7 we would have with the six-story building.  
8 The numbers I think are just important to  
9 note that.

10 The fourth category in the EIS was  
11 the land transaction itself. The land  
12 transportation calls for of course,  
13 purchase of the site and construction of  
14 the 200 space garage for Village use.  
15 That would have to be modified in our  
16 agreement with the Village and it would  
17 have to be amended. That is of course an  
18 EIS issue that would be noted in the

19           landscaping.

20           The next one is demographics and is

21           an interesting one. And this sort of sets

22           a tone for a series of items. What we

23           would be proposing with the six-story

24           alternative would be 55 dwelling units,

25           compared to 61 dwelling units with the two

## Proceedings

43

1 four-story buildings. So the development  
2 is slightly less dense and therefore, the  
3 projected population would drop from 126  
4 to 112 persons.

5 The visual resources -- this is  
6 interesting and I think I tried to phrase  
7 this as accurately as I could. The two  
8 story buildings seemed -- I think would be  
9 attractively designed, but the issue has  
10 always been that the parcel is very long,  
11 so in that matter, no matter how we design  
12 it, it still is a very long parcel and the  
13 solution has to be linear.

14 With the one building scheme, we  
15 eliminate length of a building because we  
16 are contrary as I pointed out earlier, and  
17 we are replacing that with the open space  
18 plaza. And as John pointed out, the open

19 space plaza would be next to 1 Pondfield.

20 One of the difficulties with the

21 two building scheme has always been the

22 building immediately adjacent to 1

23 Pondfield, so I think from a visual point

24 of view, there is some advantages in

25 having that plaza there and that really

1 speaks to the next item as well. We are  
2 talking about the architectural design of  
3 the building as was illustrated.

4 In terms of the historical cultural  
5 resources, a very important part of our  
6 Environmental Impact Statement because of  
7 Christ Church directly across the street.  
8 The situation is unchanged. We will be  
9 protecting the stained glass windows both  
10 during construction and also in the matter  
11 of light to protect that very attractive  
12 historic amenity for the community.

13 Traffic and parking is an  
14 interesting one in coming back to the  
15 density. The number of parking spaces is  
16 the same, so the parking ratio per  
17 dwelling is slightly increased. In  
18 response to one of the comments from F.P.

19 Clarke in their review of the EIS, we have  
20 increased the number of parking spaces per  
21 dwelling unit, and we reduced the number  
22 of kids; and also the traffic generation  
23 would be slightly reduced as part of that.

24 The engineering issues would be  
25 essentially the same. We are building the

1 same building underneath and we are  
2 building the same garage, so the site  
3 mediation and utilities of this building  
4 would be the same.

5 The community facility situation  
6 typically would be about the same. A few  
7 less people, so perhaps a slightly  
8 different impact on community facilities  
9 that was never a big issue. The one  
10 community facility that does change is the  
11 open space on the site. And the noise  
12 vibration and construction impact, the  
13 final chapters that I highlighted from the  
14 EIS. All those issues were addressed for  
15 the four-story building, but with the one  
16 six-story building, we may have some  
17 advantages in terms of construction,  
18 building one building instead of two. And

19 we perhaps could use the plaza area for  
20 construction staging which may be an  
21 advantage in terms of building the  
22 facility on Kensington Road. So I think  
23 that if we pursue this six-story building  
24 as the preferred alternative, which  
25 clearly we would like it to, I think the

1 advantages would be important to note as  
2 the Environmental Impact Statement moves  
3 through the process.

4 In the Draft Environmental Impact  
5 Statement we touched on many of these  
6 issues because it was an alternative,  
7 although not a preferred alternative.  
8 What we would like to do is reverse that  
9 certainly in the final Environmental  
10 Impact Statement and make the six-story  
11 building with a 20,000 square foot plaza  
12 in fact is the preferred alternative and  
13 details of the impact and the detail of  
14 the design. Thank you.

15 MR. PALEY: I would like to briefly

16 --

17 MR. BLESSING: I have a quick  
18 comment and question. I thought we just

19 established before John Sullivan did that,  
20 this says architectural design two 300  
21 foot buildings instead of one 300 foot  
22 building, I think you specifically said  
23 that the single design was 325 and the  
24 other single building, the Tudor style was  
25 about 250; is that correct?

Proceedings

1 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct.

2 MR. BLESSING: This needs to be  
3 amended.

4 MR. SACCARDI: That is correct.

5 MR. PALEY: After the last meeting,  
6 I had a chance to reach out to many of the  
7 speakers who came to testify because I  
8 wanted to understand their points of view.

9 Particularly, with respect to the security  
10 issue because I think we had made  
11 ourselves clear on how we anticipated in  
12 operating the open space. But during the  
13 course of those conversations, I was asked  
14 several times, why do you like this  
15 alternative now? It must be cheaper to  
16 build and that is probably why you want to  
17 do it. And the answer to that is, it is  
18 actually not cheaper to build. This is

19 the same as you heard several times. It  
20 is the same parking structure, so that  
21 costs the same. It's the same amount of  
22 square feet to build, so that is the same.  
23 It is a more efficient building to build  
24 one building so it actually could be a  
25 quicker building to build.

1           You heard it could be several  
2           months shaved off the construction process  
3           which of course would benefit the  
4           community in terms of impact, but in terms  
5           of cost, the savings there would probably  
6           be off set by the cost of the plaza. That  
7           is really not the motivation. The  
8           motivation is that this is really from our  
9           point of view, a better building. It is a  
10          better environment for the residents for  
11          several reasons which you heard, but I  
12          just want to summarize them.

13           It gives you an opportunity to  
14          create value for the building because you  
15          have open space. If you know, many of the  
16          cities around the world, the most valuable  
17          properties are the ones that face on to a  
18          plaza. It is a very desirable place to

19 be. It is not just an amenity for the  
20 neighborhood which sort of motivated us to  
21 look at it initially, but it clearly  
22 benefits the residents of the building as  
23 a place to enjoy the outdoors and also a  
24 visual amenity so that you have more light  
25 and air for the people who are living in

1 the building. And clearly, these are  
2 going to be extremely high-end  
3 condominiums. So the people living in  
4 this building and the management of this  
5 building would never tolerate the security  
6 issue becoming an issue for this building.  
7 So the fact, that is going to be operated  
8 privately, but with public accessibility,  
9 I think it is a key point that people need  
10 to understand, but also I just wanted to  
11 sort of really shift away from the  
12 security point of view because one of the  
13 -- I think comments that I heard in the  
14 course of the discussion which I think  
15 captures really the essence of what we are  
16 doing. One of the neighbors who lives  
17 directly across who we met with several  
18 times, unfortunately, I don't see her here

19           tonight -- said to me, she kind of  
20           summarized what her vision of it was and I  
21           think these are good words which is, she  
22           said I envision the space as a  
23           sophisticated European Piazza that could  
24           add real charm to the development. I  
25           think that really -- that summarized the

Proceedings 50

1 point here. It is a charming  
2 sophisticated plaza that sets off the  
3 building and really creates a better  
4 environment and that is why we have to  
5 come before you to try and encourage you  
6 to consider that as -- at this point the  
7 preferred alternative. Thank you for your  
8 attention.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do we  
10 have anything on the two building Mission  
11 style? Do you have any of those boards  
12 that you had before?

13 MR. PALEY: I don't think we have  
14 those boards tonight. We really just  
15 focused on the six-story alternative.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think John  
17 Westerfield had wanted to see those, but  
18 he was unable to attend tonight. I think

19 what we are going to do, unless somebody

20 -- unless the Board has a better idea is,

21 I guess we should open for questions from

22 the Planning Board members. Do people

23 have questions on what we have heard so

24 far?

25 MS. SMITH: Yes, I have some. Just

1 in general, anyone who wants to answer it.  
2 In the DEIS draft, you made a big point  
3 about the preferred building being the  
4 initial one with the Tudor and the Mission  
5 and two buildings, and in justifying that,  
6 you talked about scale, size, design,  
7 neighborhood context and it seems to me  
8 now you are kind of reversing course here  
9 and I am a little curious about that.

10 Among other things, when you talked  
11 about a six-story building across the  
12 street and you use that as support for  
13 having a six-story building of your own,  
14 you could also argue the contrary because  
15 you do have a six-story building across  
16 the street, and it would be a kinder  
17 gentler kind of affect to not have a  
18 complete echo on the other side.

19           So first of all, I have a thing  
20           about size, scale, and user friendliness,  
21           I mean quite aside from just a pedestrian  
22           walking down the street, just in general  
23           for the look of Bronxville, maybe from an  
24           aerial basis or from higher up on  
25           Kensington. It just seems to go me you

1 are somewhat reversing a lot of the points  
2 you made early on that sounded mighty good  
3 to me.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: If someone would  
5 like to come up to the microphone?

6 MR. PALEY: John and I could both  
7 come up. Let me just say that clearly,  
8 the four-story building is easier to do  
9 the sort of a kinder gentler, but I think  
10 John has made a huge effort in terms of  
11 creating that scale, so that in many ways,  
12 he demonstrated the scale on the street is  
13 very very similar in either case. And  
14 actually, one thing I didn't mention was  
15 that having those terraces really is also  
16 a marketing benefit to us, but I will let  
17 John talk about the scale issue.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: Not to really

19           revisit in essence, the genesis of this  
20           and why the original design was proposed,  
21           but it was very much a response to an RFP  
22           that this Village had. It was also a  
23           response to certain criteria that was in  
24           that RFP; don't exceed certain building  
25           height.

1           There was also a previous design  
2           project if you would, that the Village --  
3           I don't recall the -- but you may know  
4           better if that was approved or not.  
5           Previously, that never materialized that  
6           sort of also formalized this particular  
7           protect. We, I assume, as many others who  
8           responded to this, crafted a design and a  
9           proposal that was in conformity to that  
10          RFP, from building height to so-on. It  
11          was a sensitive approach towards --  
12          respond to previous designs that I believe  
13          was known as the Green Proposal Project.  
14          And coming up with one that we felt was  
15          much more sensitive towards Bronxville and  
16          to the indigenous architecture that  
17          existed here, to the heights of buildings  
18          and to open space et, cetera, that is

19 where we crafted, if you would, proposed  
20 the original design.

21 Well now, hence two-plus years  
22 later and in having discussions with you  
23 and other members of the community, et  
24 cetera, there seems to have been some  
25 interest in pursuing this alternative. So

1        why we compare to me, is not so much about  
2        comparing what was done before, it's like  
3        an evolution here. We went from something  
4        that had certain criteria that was a basis  
5        in which to prepare a design, to where we  
6        are today.

7                We may have been from what I  
8        understand, one of the few proposals who  
9        actually offered two styles of  
10        architecture. Frankly, I believe that is  
11        very much one of the reasons why we are  
12        here today. Why we were awarded this  
13        project. However, this alternative as you  
14        are saying now has other merits that have  
15        been expressed by many people within this  
16        community. So to me, it's not so much  
17        about comparing -- well why did we do that  
18        before and not do this then? We would

19 never be standing here today I suspect, if

20 we had proposed it.

21 MS. SMITH: I think comparing is

22 very important because if there is a

23 concept of the feeling of the Village, and

24 this is -- if you would, just take off the

25 chart a second there. Again, this is a

1 fairly dramatic change. You look to the  
2 left and you look at the 1 Pondfield Road  
3 medical building, and then you look along  
4 there and you look at the sort of -- I  
5 don't want to say exactly out of nowhere,  
6 you have a long sort of flat area and then  
7 six stories and then down and then, you  
8 know -- another thing, and I also am not  
9 clear on this to what extent trains are  
10 visible, so I don't know if you plan on  
11 getting coverage on the trains there or  
12 the trains going by that you had before.  
13 I'm just not sure that that flows in the  
14 way that your prior design had.

15 MR. PALEY: John, maybe you can  
16 just describe the, you know, the fact that  
17 this is an architectural elevation -- this  
18 is actually not a real view. This is not

19 a view because nobody can encompass that  
20 much scope. It is not a view because you  
21 have an elevation that you actually cannot  
22 see the building from -- this view is not  
23 visible because the Church is there. If  
24 you are on Sagamore, you don't see the  
25 buildings in the EIS. We probably should

1 have brought that draft.

2 MS. SMITH: I'm just thinking

3 someone from the train --

4 MR. PALEY: In some ways, this is

5 an artificial representation that distorts

6 what we are looking at. You really -- I

7 think the better view is in person on the

8 street point of view, because that is the

9 way somebody will experience it. That is

10 the reality. This is really an

11 architectural artifact that really

12 distorts it and I think it is not a fair

13 rendering, but maybe John you can --

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Bob is correct and

15 that's why we have to create now --

16 they're not even just renderings anymore,

17 they are photo montages because they

18 really paint a much more realistic

19 perspective of really how Bob says -- how  
20 we as pedestrians scale view anything for  
21 that matter. And he is correct, that is  
22 not a fair representation as one would see  
23 this. I think it's more for you to  
24 understand the design and the architecture  
25 and so-on, but in this particular case,

1 it's clearly more dramatic than it was  
2 reality.

3 MS. SMITH: I understand that.

4 What about the trains --

5 MR. SULLIVAN: At the same time, I  
6 understand your point. I understand why  
7 you are making the point that you are  
8 about the height of this --

9 MS. SMITH: But will pedestrians  
10 see a train going by when he or she is  
11 walking between the medical building and 1  
12 Pondfield Road and your building?

13 MR. SULLIVAN: I don't think so.

14 MS. SMITH: Or will there be a wall  
15 --

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Because the train  
17 tracks are below that deck line.

18 MS. SMITH: And you won't see the

19 top of the train?

20 MR. SULLIVAN: You won't see the

21 top of the trains.

22 MS. LONGOBARDO: There was a point

23 made last time and I was sort of affected

24 by that and I thought that the long

25 building might in fact amass more of the

1 train tracks, but when I asked one of you,  
2 you said it isn't visible. But is your  
3 photograph montage -- I think you should  
4 of had the second one -- will you put that  
5 one up again? I think that affects me  
6 more than anything because the idea that  
7 you are facing a long open space, I think  
8 that is why the Design Review felt it was  
9 a good plan. But I'm trying to visualize  
10 now if the two four-story buildings, what  
11 you see instead John, and maybe you can  
12 point it out, you would see -- almost  
13 drawing it, you could see concrete and the  
14 stucco and the slate or whatever that is  
15 coming down --

16 MR. SULLIVAN: The building right  
17 here.

18 MS. SMITH: Is it in your book?

19 MR. BLESSING: 3-C.

20 MS. LONGOBARDO: Is that particular

21 --

22 MR. SULLIVAN: There are many

23 visuals in the book and I apologize for

24 those who are here, they don't have the

25 ability to see that but --

1 MS. LONGOBARDO: That doesn't quite  
2 do it, because the things that you point  
3 out the entry sort of from, you know, a  
4 very crucial point in the Village looking  
5 up between Sagamore and Kensington and  
6 so-on, you see massive buildings further  
7 along. Now that affects me a lot. I'm  
8 not sure how I'm going to vote ultimately,  
9 but that is going to be a helpful thing to  
10 look at.

11 MS. SMITH: I guess the other thing  
12 I wanted to ask you about is, in some  
13 ways, you are really producing an urban  
14 garden. It's a concrete garden with the  
15 pluses and the minuses and I suppose there  
16 are some minuses construction wise -- I  
17 don't know about mainting the leakage,  
18 preventing leakage down in the garage and

19 things like that. But aside from that, I  
20 thought a woman at the last meeting Bonnie  
21 Carey I think her name was, made some very  
22 good points about how the landscaping  
23 isn't just an artificially placed thing,  
24 it is sort of everywhere, and I'm worried  
25 that this still may look harsh and not

1       inviting in and not -- because it is going  
2       to be built up on top of a platform. And  
3       it really won't be able to support a large  
4       tree or anything like that. It might be  
5       more appropriate for Westchester Avenue in  
6       White Plains or it might be more  
7       appropriate in New York City, but here,  
8       I'm just afraid that it is going to look  
9       artificial and that's really what it comes  
10      down to. So if you would like to respond  
11      to that in some way, I would be happy to  
12      hear it.

13           MR. SULLIVAN: I guess we need our  
14      landscape architect to best answer those  
15      questions, but your points are understood  
16      and acknowledged and we will do our best  
17      to respond to those through them.

18           MS. LONGOBARDO: I think what she

19 actually said at the last meeting was that  
20 most of us in Bronxville -- there are many  
21 of us who live in houses and have our own  
22 private spaces and yards and patios and  
23 so-on, and the thing that had affected me  
24 so that we are going to need this 100 foot  
25 by 250 foot green space, make it available

1 to the community. Maybe -- and what we  
2 heard because someone said the objector  
3 has changed. That meeting and the people  
4 that might love a park weren't there, but  
5 I think the point she made was not as  
6 important as it is if you live on the  
7 upper west side and you have nothing until  
8 you walk to Riverside Park for example,  
9 and that it wouldn't be as important for  
10 people. Because I was very affected that  
11 suddenly we have this rescue of green  
12 space. And that was the point she was  
13 making. But it wasn't landscape  
14 architecture, she was saying it wasn't as  
15 important to most Bronxville residents  
16 because they have their own green spaces.

17 MS. SMITH: And I think she was  
18 saying also that Kensington is a neglected

19 road and that in general, she would like  
20 to see something a little more global, you  
21 know, lower profile, not just also  
22 concentrated in one spot. Here we have  
23 our garden, but that throughout the  
24 street, that that effort be made to make  
25 it a pleasant drive and that sounded very

Proceedings

62

1 good to me.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: I would point out  
3 though that all along Kensington and  
4 Sagamore, there are apartment buildings  
5 that do not have any green space. It is  
6 filled with apartment buildings, so this  
7 is not going to serve people who live on  
8 the other side of White Plains Road who  
9 have no yards. But there are plenty of  
10 people who live on Sagamore and Kensington  
11 who don't have any green space.

12 MS. LONGOBARDO: I happen to agree  
13 with you about that, but I was quoting  
14 what she was saying which was not exactly  
15 what Adrienne concluded from that.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there other  
17 questions?

18 MR. BLESSING: Yes, I have a

19 comment. At some point in time if the one  
20 building design was approved and done,  
21 what would prevent that park from ever  
22 being developed again and putting up  
23 additional buildings?

24 MR. PALEY: Probably some kind of  
25 restrictive covenant that would prevent

1 that from happening.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we would put

3 that in the special permit. Other

4 questions? Unless somebody has some other

5 ideas on the Board, I think we will reopen

6 the public hearing and take the comments

7 if we could, on the design, the further

8 comments and then at the end of the

9 comments on the design, we are going to

10 turn our attention to as long we can stand

11 it, to the actual text of the DEIS. I

12 would just report that we do have letters.

13 Bob I think quoted from Deseray Bensil

14 (ph), I probably got her name wrong. And

15 she did indeed said she supports the one

16 building alternative.

17 I also have a letter from Alfred

18 Latimer who is the owner of 22 and 28

19 Sagamore Road. He appeared at the last  
20 meeting to say he favored the two building  
21 approach and he now says he has changed  
22 his position and favors the one building  
23 approach. That is all that I see on the  
24 comments from the public.

25 MS. LONGOBARDO: Security was his

Proceedings

1 issue; wasn't it?

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. He says he  
3 has now changed his mind. Okay, we will  
4 reopen the public hearing. Dorothy?

5 MS. BRENNAN: First of all,  
6 Dorothy Brennan, to get the legal part out  
7 of the way, I would like you to find out  
8 the legal standing of the building,  
9 because I heard someone say we sold it to  
10 this gentleman. That is this building and  
11 we can't sell it. And I have two lawyers  
12 and I will give you the names so you can  
13 call and find out why -- from the last  
14 time we were trying to build over there  
15 and then get that straight, just because  
16 there shouldn't be any glitches in some  
17 future.

18 The building -- first of all, let

19 me straighten people out about the park.  
20 Sagamore Park which was built in -- we  
21 started to fight for it in '66. I led the  
22 fight on that and happily, the League of  
23 Women Voters backed me and we talked the  
24 Village into buying the property as a  
25 pocket park, the only open area in that

1 area.

2 This area as I've always called  
3 Mildred Park because she has been lobbying  
4 for it, and I think that the idea is not a  
5 bad one contrary to what people think. I  
6 have no diversion to green space, but what  
7 my concern is as a six-story building, I  
8 don't know how far the set back will be,  
9 and I don't know how tall that's really  
10 going to go up because that is the high  
11 point on Kensington; and I would like to  
12 know those questions. And I don't know --  
13 it's coming down from 61 to 55 as one  
14 building, which means there will be less  
15 people there, but six stories still seems  
16 to me a lot. The seven story that the  
17 gentleman spoke of is very very far back  
18 from the street, and you don't really

19 notice it because there is a big rock base  
20 for the first floor and then it goes into  
21 the Mission style, and so it doesn't  
22 appear to be seven stories. But again,  
23 it's set very very far back from the  
24 street so you don't even notice it because  
25 it has trees around it. How far back will

1 this building be set? How many trees can  
2 the street support? The sidewalk now is  
3 five-feet wide, the street itself is  
4 twenty-feet wide, so we are talking  
5 contrary to what this picture is. We are  
6 talking about a very narrow section and it  
7 isn't as big and esplanadie (ph) looking  
8 as it looks in that picture. So I would  
9 just like to have those things clarified  
10 because I think it's important to note --  
11 remember last time I mentioned to you  
12 about the balloons? I know it sounds  
13 foolish, but it works. It gives you an  
14 idea of just how high up the building is  
15 going to be and it gives you an idea when  
16 you are standing there of what it is going  
17 to look like. And if it's set back, it  
18 might not be as appalling as it may be if

19 it is very close to the sidewalk.

20 Also, when you did your

21 Environmental Impact, it wasn't six

22 stories. What is the reaction of Alga

23 Court and the building along Alga Court,

24 what would be the sound barrier from this

25 building which is a six-story building

1 over in Alga Court which I think it is  
2 four or five stories at least; will there  
3 be any sound? Sound back and forth and  
4 that has to be tested with the new style  
5 building.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: I can answer that  
7 question. There is a noise study in our  
8 -- but the noise study is based on a  
9 four-story building. I think these are  
10 very good points which is why I'm trying  
11 as best as I can painfully slowly to try  
12 to get an answer as to which alternative  
13 we want to move along with, because you  
14 raise a very valid point. If we are going  
15 to pick the six-stories, all of these  
16 studies we have and everything will have  
17 to be redone. So you know, unless we come  
18 to a decision, which we can't do all of

19           this kind of stuff, so the answer to your  
20           question is if we go to the six-story, a  
21           lot of -- maybe not a lot, but a material  
22           amount of what's in the DEIS has to be  
23           redone and if we are going to do that, we  
24           have a get all of this. So that is why I  
25           keep saying we need to come to an answer

Proceedings

68

1 if we can. I am sort of jotting some down  
2 some questions, so maybe we can get some  
3 answers to.

4 MS. LONGOBARDO: But aren't some of  
5 those -- I guess Dorothy's point would be  
6 that in fact the noise study should be  
7 done with the alternative? You are saying  
8 that we should make a decision and then  
9 look at what it would be.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: The decision is not  
11 irrevocable, but if we are going to make a  
12 decision and we just don't like the  
13 six-story alternative period, then there  
14 is no need to do the noise study. If we  
15 say yeah, we think that is going to be the  
16 favorable alternative, then the applicant  
17 goes out and does that. It doesn't at all  
18 mean we have irrevocable chosen that

19 design because all of the studies come  
20 back and show all these problems and we  
21 don't like that, we are going back to the  
22 two building approach.

23 MS. LONGOBARDO: I guess some of  
24 the things we may find if for example,  
25 such as the Design Review Committee and I

Proceedings

1 thought the one building design yielded a  
2 park and the way we should go, if I heard  
3 enough negative things about the six-story  
4 building as a result of some studies that  
5 are done, I might waiver.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: You might go back.  
7 You might change your mind. Until we  
8 finalize the Environmental Impact  
9 Statement, we can always change our minds  
10 and go back.

11 MS. LONGOBARDO: Well, things like  
12 the point about how far back the buildings  
13 are, the buildings are not far back.  
14 Four-story buildings weren't set back, nor  
15 are these. I don't think John that these  
16 are closer to the curb line than the  
17 others? No, these are --

18 MS. BRENNAN: How far back are they

19 set from the front entrance?

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think John, if you

21 can tell us if you have any answers, I

22 believe the two questions were, how high

23 were the buildings in the amount of set

24 back? Was the question how far is the

25 whole building set back, or was the

Proceedings

70

1 question how far are stories five and six  
2 set back?

3 MS. BRENNAN: I wanted to know, the  
4 building --

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: The building itself?

6 MS. BRENNAN: Yeah. I'm talking  
7 about density as you come up Kensington  
8 Road. If it's close to the sidewalk which  
9 is five-feet wide, it's going to give you  
10 a feeling of density. If it is set back a  
11 little bit and that is a wider section on  
12 that particular piece of property, I  
13 believe is a wider section of the  
14 property, because the property down where  
15 the park is going to be is narrow. It  
16 widens down and then it comes back again.  
17 So I think that there might be a chance to  
18 set it back a little further than five

19 feet, because if it is only set back five  
20 feet, you are hardly going to be able to  
21 put trees on the land because you wouldn't  
22 be able to walk up street. So these are  
23 all the things that need to be clarified  
24 to know what it is going to look like for  
25 the sake of the people -- and it this

## Proceedings

71

1 building is opposite the Kensington  
2 development, the townhouses there, and the  
3 impacts on them as well as the impacts on  
4 the Alga Court Houses on the other side,  
5 because you are not very far from the Alga  
6 Court where you are building.

7 MR. SULLIVAN: Lets just take a  
8 couple of stabs at those. First of all,  
9 the site is absolutely parallel. The site  
10 does not widen out as progresses north up  
11 Kensington. It is 100 feet deep at the  
12 southerly point where abuts 1 Pondfield  
13 Road, as it is 625 feet to the north, it  
14 is a rectangle. 100 feet by 625 -- and  
15 then it tapers to a point so it doesn't  
16 flair out. This building as it sits on  
17 top of this plaza, at it's nearest point  
18 to the property line is 15 feet.

19 MS. BRENNAN: 16 feet.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: 15 feet, both plans.

21 This is one or the previous one. The

22 nearest point there are points where it is

23 set back as I illustrated in the drawing.

24 Remember, that from the property line why

25 it may exist today that there is at that

1 point a narrow sidewalk and parallel  
2 parking, that as it also has been  
3 presented and has been illustrated on this  
4 and in the previous drawings, that the  
5 entire public right of way is going to be  
6 reconstructed where we are capturing some  
7 of those off-street parking spaces; moving  
8 the sidewalk out, creating a planter bed,  
9 creating a new street scape, street trees,  
10 there are public improvements made within  
11 that corridor between the right of way.

12 Kensington in essence, will be  
13 redefined as it exists today. Improving  
14 street scape, pedestrian space, and the  
15 separation between that and this building.

16 So to answer some of your points -- those  
17 are just some answers to your question.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: John, do you have

19 the height of the building?

20 MR. SULLIVAN: I don't. I battered

21 this around so many times, I should know

22 that, shouldn't I? The previous -- we

23 exceed 50 feet I think this one is 68 feet

24 to the highest point. That has a little

25 to do with parapits and other elements

1 like that.

2 MS. LONGOBARDO: I know you told us  
3 probably in the beginning and then two  
4 years ago John, and the other designs too,  
5 about improving the street scape, but that  
6 is a very important point to have it at  
7 these meetings and present it to the  
8 public.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: I agree.

10 MS. LONGOBARDO: Some of the things  
11 that we hear are comments -- I still hear  
12 about Kensington and how they don't pay  
13 any attention to Kensington, and it's a  
14 mess and the traffic is bad and it's  
15 dirty, et cetera, et cetera and the  
16 complaints are not about either style or  
17 either kind of project, it has to do with  
18 the whole issue. But I think that would

19 be a good thing to have brought up and I

20 don't think they particularly have --

21 MR. SULLIVAN: Unfortunately, this

22 is a photograph montage rendering has

23 clearly -- but the land scape architect

24 plans to mind you -- but you are right, in

25 the future perhaps, we should make certain

1 that that point is well known that there  
2 are off site improvements all along  
3 Kensington Road, the entire length of  
4 this, so some 700 feet or so because we  
5 need to go north where we are entering  
6 into that access drive to Metro North that  
7 is approved.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: John, that  
9 improvement in the landscaping depends  
10 upon the design of the building and which  
11 design is chosen.

12 MR. SULLIVAN: No, it's not.

13 MR. AVIL: Yes, I'd like to make a  
14 comment in terms of -- in regards to what  
15 Dorothy said about the noise  
16 reverberation. I think it's possible that  
17 one building will have less noise  
18 reverberating back to Alga Court and the

19 two buildings, given that the one building  
20 is slightly higher.

21 MR. SULLIVAN: That is an accurate  
22 statement as well.

23 MS. ATTAIN (ph): My name is René  
24 Attain (ph), and I live up off of North  
25 Kensington Road. I would like to

1 reiterate the extreme responsiveness of  
2 WCI Spectrum, and to all of the people  
3 particularly up on North Kensington Road  
4 over the past two years. And if anybody  
5 knows me, they will know that I really do  
6 put people to task.

7 So, we work very closely with the  
8 people with Kevin and with the people in  
9 his group, so this plan has really been a  
10 work in progress and has been an evolution  
11 as Mr. Sullivan has used that term. So we  
12 really really do appreciate all of the  
13 work that has gone into this.

14 I would like to try to drill this  
15 out to the public because it is kind of a  
16 complex thing to rap your head around, and  
17 this is how I sort of put this thing forth  
18 to people.

19           It is very simply put when we try  
20           to visualize them and I know there are a  
21           number of people who are trying to sharpen  
22           their pencils and so forth when they write  
23           down how many feet there are; when you  
24           look at the two building plan, there still  
25           is a visual connection with that central

1 court and I think that there were a couple  
2 of renderings with the two building plan  
3 and the central court where there were  
4 some columns and so forth, so they are  
5 almost like connection. So when I say  
6 Plan A, Plan A is two buildings and two  
7 football fields long. So, go down  
8 Kensington Road and look at two buildings  
9 two footballs feet long. Or Plan B, with  
10 Plan B, you get green space and one  
11 building one football field long, but  
12 15 feet taller. Which one do you want? I  
13 sort of want Plan B. I'd rather give up  
14 one football field with 15 feet and get  
15 all the green space. And there are all of  
16 these other attendant benefits that go  
17 along with Plan B. Many of them were  
18 discussed by the other gentleman here, but

19 I would like to repeat some of them.

20 With green space, we do get all of

21 the increased values with that amenity.

22 Not only for the residents of the building

23 that is going to be built, but also for

24 the other residents in Bronxville. I

25 think all of us know that.

1           It also is in line with the  
2           Village's philosophy of decreasing  
3           footprint size. I think when the Village  
4           moratorium was built, there was a push to  
5           decrease footprint size. I don't know,  
6           two football fields versus one football  
7           field in terms of the size of the building  
8           as a significant decrease in footprint  
9           size.

10           I do understand and appreciate the  
11           concerns that were raised in the last  
12           meeting in terms of security, but the  
13           developer has addressed those in a very  
14           responsible way by saying that the  
15           building would take on the security and  
16           monitor the security there, and it really  
17           doesn't make any sense to move them. If  
18           you have any problems taking place within

19           that green space because their tenants  
20           would not be happy if there were problems  
21           there.

22                    I can also say from my own  
23           experience, because I work with the New  
24           York City Police Department patrolling the  
25           24th Precinct prior to justification in

1 the early '90s, and the last thing you  
2 want to have is that small constricted  
3 space. It always concerned me that small  
4 constricted spaces in what I am terming  
5 Plan A, you want to have an open vista.  
6 Open vistas are much easier to patrol, or  
7 to see whether or not sneaky things are  
8 going on.

9 So it always concerned me and as a  
10 residents who gets off of that train, I  
11 can tell you that there were problems  
12 prior to having demolition take place.  
13 There were a lot people congregating  
14 there, and you know, it's been better  
15 since demolition took place and I was  
16 concerned when I saw that, you know, that  
17 the original plan and we discussed it.  
18 And as I said WCI spectrum was very

19 responsive in giving us something that  
20 addressed many many of the concerns that  
21 we had on many many fronts, and one of  
22 those things they haven't even talked  
23 about yet, but you know, this has been one  
24 of them.

25 And then the last issue was just

1 that it does accelerate the building  
2 process which was touched upon and that  
3 may seem like a small issue to some  
4 people, but for a lot of us who do live in  
5 that area, it is a big issue to us,  
6 because we still don't know where all of  
7 that parking is going to go, and a lot of  
8 the parking does come down to us already.  
9 So that displaced parking is going to be a  
10 big issue for us and anything to mitigate  
11 that issue is important to us.

12 The other thing that I would like  
13 to get onto the docket if possible, since  
14 the stenographer is here, I just would  
15 like to confirm receipt of a letter that I  
16 sent prior to the summer break which had  
17 to do with tax issues?

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe I recall

19           seeing it. Do you recall that?

20           MR. PICI: I don't have the

21           complete file here, but we can make sure

22           it's forwarded.

23           MR. CHAIRMAN: Earlier this summer?

24           MS. ATTAIN (ph): Yes, sir. It

25           just had to do with --

Proceedings 80

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: You were addressing  
2 the potential number of school children?

3 MS. ATTAIN (ph): Yes, sir.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we do have  
5 that.

6 MS. ATTAIN (ph): And because this  
7 project does affect all of the people in  
8 this Village -- because I think all of us  
9 are very anxious to have something happen  
10 on Kensington Road, and because we all are  
11 counting on something very positive  
12 happening on Kensington Road, I'm just  
13 encouraging a full analysis will take  
14 place with regards to age restriction  
15 versus age targeted communities; and one  
16 point was in favor of the age restricted  
17 community. I have an open mind towards  
18 that, and I just want to make sure that

19           there is a very stringent due diligence  
20           taken with regards to that, so that we can  
21           maximize the tax revenue that comes out of  
22           this project. And I heard in the last  
23           meeting, and I understand that it is a  
24           moving target, that the tax revenue that  
25           was being projected was in the area of 1

1 to 1.5 million. And in prior meetings,  
2 the tax revenue projected was in the area  
3 of \$700,000 and \$750,000. So again, I  
4 understand that it is a moving target.

5 Students estimated were in the area  
6 of 90 students in one meeting and now it's  
7 more of negligible number, so -- I'm  
8 repeating myself. I understand it as a  
9 moving target, I just want to make sure  
10 that it is very stringent and due diligence  
11 down in this area so we can really  
12 maximize the amount of tax revenue that  
13 comes out of this and I hope everything  
14 works out well for the Village. That is  
15 all.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I would  
17 just like to make a comment. I think part  
18 of the confusion by the number of children

19 potentially in the school -- and by the  
20 way, the Environmental Impact Statement  
21 does have a section on that and in various  
22 studies and it is an important issue too.

23 I think the applicant has tried has  
24 with is sort of projection of what the  
25 number of students that might be, if it

1 was not age-targeted. So like the  
2 maximum, it was just a different design  
3 and in comparing to other apartment  
4 developments, I'm not sure if it's a  
5 specific comparison to the Avalon, but for  
6 example, comparing it if it had the same  
7 number of units as the Avalon and it was  
8 children friendly, and how many there  
9 might be, that's one number which is an  
10 extremely conservative number. And then  
11 another number that the objection of what  
12 they realistically expect considering that  
13 it is not age restricted, sort of age  
14 targeted, so that is why they may have --  
15 but they do have numbers in there that are  
16 very conservative as I mentioned, so you  
17 can maybe see like the worst possible  
18 affect. Thank you for those comments.

19 MR. MURPHY: Good evening, my name  
20 is Bill Murphy and I live at 5 North West  
21 Way in the Village of Bronxville. I'm  
22 here to speak in favor of the one building  
23 concept. Currently, as you all know, I am  
24 the Village Parking Commissioner, I gotta  
25 be crazy, but I want to make it clear that

1 I am not here to speak on parking, that is  
2 an issue that has been resolved; and  
3 secondly, I am not here with the Village  
4 agenda. I am here strictly as a private  
5 citizen who has lived in the Village since  
6 1937 and as you all know, I'm the Mayor  
7 that bought this site, so I want to take a  
8 little bit of your time and regurgitate  
9 some history, and then I need John to  
10 handle a couple of pictures.

11 These are issues that go back to  
12 '70's in the Kensington Road Sagamore  
13 area, and in the late '60's, I was a  
14 member of the Zoning Board and in the late  
15 '70s through '87, I was a member of the  
16 Board of Trustees and Mayor. So I was a  
17 witness to a number of the things that I  
18 want to address, all of which brought far

19 more clearly to my sensitivity, the  
20 subject now called or very often called  
21 open space. It was a new phrase in the  
22 '60s.

23 As a result of that, I have a very  
24 strong feeling towards the need for open  
25 space, whether we are talking about

1 Kensington or wherever. During the '90s,  
2 the Village conducted two referendums,  
3 nonbinding referendums over a three-year  
4 period of time. You should be happy the  
5 Planning Board had modified and  
6 strengthened it, you don't have nonbinding  
7 referendums.

8 The subject was open space versus  
9 development. Area No. 1, is now called  
10 the Rock Pile and was called the Rock Pile  
11 then. Area No. 2, which related to 48  
12 Sagamore where the consideration was to  
13 substantially modify that building and  
14 utilize it as a parking lot for a larger  
15 apartment house.

16 Both referendums were Village wide.  
17 Both resulted in over 1,500 votes being  
18 cast which is unheard of in this Village

19 as you know. And both resulted if you can  
20 believe it, in tie votes. 750 to 750  
21 whatever it was. In which case, the  
22 Village Board preceding my becoming a  
23 member of the Village Board, made the  
24 decision in favor of open space.

25 Subsequent to all of that, there

1 was a request for a zoning variance at  
2 what is now 52, 50, 52 Sagamore. That  
3 area was open. It was being purchased at  
4 56, 54 or 56 buildings were being  
5 acquired, people acquired that and wanted  
6 to build what's been built and they needed  
7 a small limited zoning variance.

8 I will tell you, Dick Ashworth and  
9 I were the two members of the Zoning Board  
10 that voted against that variance, but  
11 there was always five.

12 Today, 48 Sagamore and the Rock  
13 Pile stand as they were in the '50s and  
14 the '60s and as they've been since then.  
15 52 Sagamore has been a part of the housing  
16 stock of the Village for 25 to 30 years.  
17 While these histories are not directly  
18 pertinent to the property in the area we

19 are talking about, they are pertinent to

20 what I call the Sagamore Kensington

21 triangle.

22 The Village in a very strong way

23 made itself understood that it had serious

24 feelings about that. Two tie votes that

25 don't necessarily cast today, but the

1 Board and the majority of the people did  
2 hold for open space and that has been an  
3 underlying principle that has guided  
4 Village Boards and Zoning Boards and  
5 Planning Boards on and on since that time.

6 John, if you that up, I think it is  
7 the picture -- shows the right -- the one  
8 in your left hand.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: From here we  
10 can't see all of that.

11 MR. MURPHY: While you are getting  
12 that ready, I do want to point out that is  
13 not my car but the scenario of my car.  
14 Every couple of days since our last  
15 meeting -- and if you sit in that car and  
16 you look north on Kensington and you used  
17 to have that -- don't have tonight, one of  
18 the early two building renditions that

19 shows this view.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: It is in the DEIS as  
21 a rendering.

22 MR. MURPHY: Don't bother pulling  
23 them out. It is already too late, and I  
24 have a young lady here that needs to get  
25 home to New Jersey. The point was to me

1 that those two buildings made a tight  
2 canyon and it was not what we had  
3 visualized way back. This is far closer  
4 to that.

5 When you look from -- essentially,  
6 where that car is parked and you look  
7 north, it is open, you got a view of open  
8 space. The section that runs from here  
9 back to there, shows almost where the old  
10 garage stand at the moment. That is  
11 actually further back. If you stand at  
12 the corner and you look up there and you  
13 see that you miserable old building that  
14 should have been torn down -- there is a  
15 reason it didn't come down, but it will in  
16 this project, you are at least aware that  
17 there is open space.

18 When that building comes down and

19           this goes in, it is indicated that you  
20           have more open space and you've got much  
21           more of the ambiance that was just being  
22           talked about, and I don't want to belabor  
23           that point. So I really encourage you as  
24           the Planning Board, to take the step that  
25           sets -- let's get off the dime and let's

1 go with one building.

2 Let me tell you a couple of things  
3 the we the Board that purchased that site  
4 thought we were going to see. We thought  
5 we were buying a site for a million  
6 dollars and this was over 3. There was  
7 other things that went on over that period  
8 of time that changed the economics all  
9 together. We thought we were looking at a  
10 site and John, his partner Eleanor, the  
11 first rendition showed service parking  
12 with townhouse type of construction that  
13 would take care of 20 to 25 resident  
14 families. That was kind of what our dream  
15 was. As I said, by the time things got  
16 closed, by the time a \$40,000 demolition  
17 cost \$500,000, many other things have  
18 changed, including the economics. And so

19 the fact that we are looking at 55 living  
20 units versus 25, and all of the other  
21 things that are coming to the Village out  
22 of this protect, I just think we need to  
23 get moving.

24 And I will add one thing -- Dorothy  
25 was talking about the width of the current

Proceedings

1 space, because when the smoke stack came  
2 down, we didn't take that parking lot all  
3 the way out as far as it is where the  
4 garage was, so you do have what visually  
5 seems to be wider and narrower, but in  
6 fact the property line John, as you said,  
7 are absolutely straight and you been  
8 dealing with them.

9 I would like to ask you to listen  
10 to Susan Latimer who is Al's daughter.  
11 She is here from New Jersey to present  
12 what her dad said and I will tell you  
13 parenthetically, Al and I have been close  
14 friends since third grade and I knew he  
15 had to get back to Saint Charles, so I  
16 took the time to call up Bob Paley and we  
17 sat down and Al was able to talk directly  
18 with Paley and get a number of his

19 questions answered to his satisfaction and  
20 therefore wrote the letter that Susan is  
21 going to present to you. Thank you.

22 MS. LATTIMER: Hi, my name is Susan  
23 Latimer Donovan. I just wanted to read --  
24 my father asked me to read this letter  
25 that he sent to Mr. Henderson September

## Proceedings

90

1 22nd. Dear Mr. Henderson, on  
2 September 16th, I met with Bill Murphy,  
3 Parking Commissioner and Robert Paley of  
4 WCI Communities Inc. Mr. Paley clarified  
5 several questions concerning the proposed  
6 project on Kensington Road. At the Board  
7 meeting on September 14th, I had voiced my  
8 preference for the two building project.  
9 The primary reason for this was that I was  
10 opposed to a park at the south end of the  
11 project. I was informed by Mr. Paley that  
12 the platform above the garage would be  
13 some ten feet or more above street level  
14 at the southern boundary of the  
15 development. The four-story building  
16 would be at 45 to 50 feet above the  
17 platform making it 55 feet above the  
18 street at the south end of the

19 development, and 20 to 30 feet taller than

20 the present professional building.

21 The so-called park or green space

22 would be on top of the platform and

23 several feet above curb level. It would

24 be owned by the development completely

25 fenced and maintained by the Condominium

## Proceedings

91

1 Association. It would be treated as the  
2 front yard of the proposed six-story  
3 building, to be built on the northern part  
4 of the property. Although the front yard  
5 might be open to the public during the  
6 day, it would be closed at night. Since  
7 it is also above street level, I  
8 personally doubt that many people, other  
9 than the development's residents, would  
10 use this front yard during the day.

11 The tiered set back of the fifth  
12 and sixth floors of the six-story north  
13 building, are a fine effort to soften the  
14 massive appearance of the proposed  
15 six-story building.

16 As the height of the platform was  
17 not clear to me at the meeting on  
18 September 14th, and because the green

19 space will be considered the front yard of  
20 the proposed six-story building and that  
21 will be fenced and locked at night, I have  
22 changed my position. I now favor the  
23 construction of one building at the north  
24 end of the property.

25 Furthermore, having the front yard

1 of the development at the south end of  
2 Kensington Road will enhance the open look  
3 generated by the Christ Church Cemetery  
4 near the foot of Sagamore Road.

5 Sincerely, Alfred F. Latimer II, the owner  
6 of 22 and 28 Sagamore Road. Thank you.

7 MS. CALLAHAN: It looks  
8 overwhelming, but it's not. I would like  
9 to read this. It just makes it a little  
10 bit more easier for me. Last Wednesday, a  
11 few of us met with Bob Paley and he was  
12 kind enough to discuss the first and the  
13 last plan for Kensington Road. Some of us  
14 were never included in the first  
15 preliminary discussion within the  
16 community in the last two years, so it's  
17 actually the first opportunity we've had  
18 to sit down with him. We are very

19           thankful for his time.

20                   I know the developer would like us  
21           to come here and support one building over  
22           the other, and there are individuals who  
23           live five or six blocks away on the north  
24           end of Kensington Road who have their own  
25           concerns which are valid, but my

1 perspective is from a person who lives  
2 directly across the street next to Christ  
3 Church.

4 I have heard already that they  
5 think Gramatan Court is a seven-story  
6 building, if you even look at the building  
7 and if a Village historical aspect of  
8 Gramatan Court it is actually a four-story  
9 building. Because it is built on  
10 limestone going up, the rear of the  
11 building actually has three levels of  
12 basement. So that is what you are  
13 referring to with seven levels.

14 When I look at the two buildings  
15 again, both buildings are gorgeous. It is  
16 very hard to say I like one over the  
17 other. The simplest think I can do is  
18 actually break down the benefits and the

19 negatives of both buildings. And again  
20 for me, on how those buildings compact the  
21 already existing road issues.

22 When I look at the six-story  
23 building with the park, it absolutely has  
24 benefits to it, especially during the  
25 construction phase. We are hopefully not

1       decided, but hopefully that park area will  
2       be used as a staging area to get some of  
3       that construction off Kensington Road. It  
4       will be a difficult period for two years  
5       at best, no matter what project goes in.

6             The next one is I understand  
7       certainly the attractive selling feature  
8       of having a park, without a doubt. I am  
9       sure people would much rather look out  
10      their front yard and see an open area than  
11      not, but I also think that there are a  
12      couple of questions in regards to green  
13      space. In regards to the Village won't  
14      own it, it is private property and I know  
15      we have come tonight and we talked about  
16      how that space is going to be used; it is  
17      gated, is it not? You know, on the south  
18      end? Is it ten feet above four levels and

19 then another three feet of a gate?

20 Nothing has been decided and more

21 importantly, nothing is decided. Maybe

22 that has to be changed, I don't know.

23 What I would hate to see is it be sold a

24 bill of goods that the park is going to be

25 like this, and it's going to go open to

1 the community for the daytime which I  
2 think you just said wasn't the fact that  
3 most people during the daytime are going  
4 to be only using it who actually live in  
5 that building, not the actual public, but  
6 I would hate whatever to find in the  
7 beginning would be changed in a year, or  
8 two years, or three years from now, so  
9 when I ask for it to be deeded and  
10 whatever the use is, can it be deeded for  
11 a five to seven-year period, so this would  
12 be consistent over a period of time?

13 I'm sorry, I lost my train here.

14 The initial plan for me, I happen to like  
15 it better. I appreciate the architecture  
16 styles in both and taken into  
17 consideration the stone building and the  
18 Tudor style of the Church, as well as the

19 Mediterranean style of Gramatan Court. To  
20 me the two land scaped tree lined streets  
21 of both buildings would take the lead in  
22 to a residential area.

23 This is not a commercial area, it  
24 is not a downtown area as it was referred  
25 to on Wednesday, it is not the business

1 district, it is zoned for a residential  
2 street.

3 Kensington Road may border on  
4 business district, but it is a residential  
5 street and it's my hope that the project  
6 will be in continuum of a residential  
7 community.

8 The most important part of this  
9 aspect no matter what you build, is really  
10 a question that I think can be directed  
11 more towards the Planning Board or the  
12 Village, with this DEIS. Last week  
13 several residents on Kensington Road  
14 actually called me and they were trying to  
15 stop this project in total and I don't  
16 really think that is fair. There are many  
17 parking issues or traffic issues that  
18 weren't addressed and I would kind of like

19 to go over them so they can be added into

20 your report so you can address them.

21 Kensington Road itself, the major

22 traffic areas are from Avon Road going to

23 the merge of Kensington Road and Sagamore

24 Roads. This area gets used as a speed

25 area with nothing to break it in the

1 middle, so my question is, what can you do  
2 between Avon Road and Sagamore and  
3 Kensington Road to slow down traffic?

4 That is my first question.

5 My second question is, how do you  
6 regulate the merge intersection of  
7 Kensington and Sagamore Road, since this  
8 is a high pedestrians area for the  
9 children that are going to school and  
10 people who are going on to the train?

11 Does that make sense to you? Do you  
12 understand what I mean by that? Can you  
13 please address the double parking issue in  
14 front of Blue Moon? That issue could go  
15 from anywhere in the Village, but in this  
16 particular instance when the folks at the  
17 Blue Moon are double parked there, there  
18 are complaints already in this area. So I

19 would like you to address the double  
20 parking issue in front of the Blue Moon.  
21 As well as regulating the standing traffic  
22 for commuters who come off the train.  
23 The last one, how do you regulate  
24 the U-turn? This wide open space on a  
25 second plan in the six-story building,

1 certainly does open up the area. It also  
2 opens it up so wide and it also encourages  
3 more U-turns in that area, you know,  
4 guidance on traffic in that area, so how  
5 does the second plan regulate that?

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: I wasn't  
7 understanding the U-turn question, can you  
8 --

9 MS. CALLAHAN: Right here, do you  
10 have the Blue Moon right here, and you  
11 have Sagamore here as well as Kensington  
12 here, traditionally, when people in this  
13 area -- on this side of the street going  
14 from here all the way back here, you have  
15 standing traffic. To get off the train  
16 during rush hour times, to go up to -- how  
17 they get off the train so the traffic here  
18 is usually one row sometimes two. Over

19 here, it is parked in a business, but the  
20 problem is when people go in, they want to  
21 drop off their families and they get take  
22 out and they can't find parking so they  
23 double park in the street here. The  
24 people coming down this side, that is a  
25 wide open area and you only have

Proceedings

99

1 pedestrian crossing on this side and way  
2 down here in front of 1 Pondfield, you  
3 have traffic that goes here, here, over  
4 here, and folks who come down on this side  
5 and then do the U-turn instead of going to  
6 the traffic circle -- nobody goes through  
7 that traffic circle, they will come in  
8 this area and they do a U-turn and then go  
9 right back up the street.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't -- that  
11 sounds like a Village problem, but I  
12 didn't understand --

13 MS. CALLAHAN: I guess my question  
14 is, don't they impact the other?

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: That was my  
16 question. I didn't see how the one  
17 building versus the two building would  
18 affect that traffic pattern.

19 MS. CALLAHAN: It is my  
20 understanding that from Bob Paley --

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you use the mic?

22 MS. CALLAHAN: It is my  
23 understanding from Bob Paley on Wednesday  
24 that this was the time that these concerns  
25 should be addressed and be added in to

1 your DEIS.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. I just  
3 didn't understand your point of how the  
4 one building would exasperate the two  
5 buildings.

6 MS. CALLAHAN: I think it makes it  
7 worse because it opens up the area even  
8 wider.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: It really doesn't  
10 because the street stays the same width.  
11 It doesn't open any more space.

12 MS. CALLAHAN: It's maybe a matter  
13 of perception.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

15 MS. CALLAHAN: I know that whatever  
16 the ultimatum comes, I don't think the  
17 community is going to have so much impact  
18 on this as folks are led to believe.

19           Ultimately, whatever you decide as far as  
20           you work in the street we will respect  
21           whatever decision made and we will welcome  
22           our new development and neighbor.

23           MR. CHAIRMAN: I would just comment  
24           on the legal point. I think, I believe I  
25           can comment on that. This application

1 requires a special permit and so in the  
2 process of issuing the special permit, we  
3 can put conditions on the special permit.  
4 Unlike the normal Site Plan review, where  
5 we sort of approve or don't approve it, I  
6 think with a special permit we have more  
7 freedom to say if we issue a special  
8 permit, but it is subject to all of these  
9 conditions. So I think the one thing we  
10 would definitely address are the safety  
11 concerns. If we go with this design, the  
12 safety concerns for the park area I would  
13 suspect would be subject to a lot of  
14 conditions and those conditions will run  
15 indefinitely, and they not expire.

16 MS. LONGOBARDO: I don't mean to  
17 make a joke, but we can't have a condition  
18 that people shouldn't make illegal

19 U-turns. But I know you can get it into

20 the conversation and it should be noted.

21 It really doesn't make a difference

22 because the set back is still the same

23 whether it is one building or two

24 buildings. You think it just looks wider.

25 MS. CALLAHAN: Where does it happen

1 then?

2 MS. LONGOBARDO: It doesn't really  
3 make a difference.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point  
5 is, she wants the issue addressed whether  
6 or not the one building or the two  
7 building makes a difference.

8 MS. LONGOBARDO: Just general  
9 traffic safety, I agree.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Dorothy, you have  
11 another comment Dorothy?

12 MS. BRENNAN: Can I speak again?

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

14 MS. BRENNAN: The perception of  
15 course is completely wrong in that picture  
16 but Sagamore is very steep and Kensington  
17 Road starts off rather flat and then goes  
18 up, so that is why it looks as if it is a

19 giant plaza. It's not going to be changed

20 at all.

21 One of the things -- there is many

22 questions as far as parking goes, because

23 this is going to be a nightmare. It is

24 going to be a nightmare for the people who

25 are traveling. It is going to be a

1 nightmare for the people in the  
2 neighborhoods and children, cars -- where  
3 are they going to park? The people that  
4 are parking there now? Are the business  
5 districts in trouble? Where are their  
6 cars going to go that are parking there  
7 now? Is the builder perhaps going to do  
8 the parking first so we can use the garage  
9 again? I don't know. There is a million  
10 questions where I have already got an idea  
11 of about where the workmen can park, but I  
12 do want to caution you, it took us seven  
13 years with the last Kensington  
14 development, I God for bid dont' ever  
15 expect that to happen now, I think we have  
16 gone a long way. I don't think you have  
17 to get off the dime. I think that you  
18 have to take your time. It is the last

19           developable plot in Bronxville, and it  
20           means a great deal to have this done  
21           properly. I think the developers as they  
22           are working now obviously to show they  
23           have really good interests on what our  
24           concerns are, so I have no concerns about  
25           this developer, but I do feel this is

1 something that has to be take very  
2 cautiously.

3 As far as taxes go, this is going  
4 to be part -- as you know Condos and  
5 Co-ops go into the commercial taxing end,  
6 and it is an entirely different payment.

7 This is going to tilt the balance of  
8 apartments in Bronxville compared to  
9 private homes, so the taxes are going to  
10 be higher on the private homes in many  
11 ways, because the apartments do not carry  
12 the taxes that they should carry and that  
13 is by state law and there is nothing we  
14 can do about that and as you are all  
15 involved in this -- not the -- the  
16 assessments, you will understand that even  
17 better. So this is something that will  
18 have an affect on the Village in many ways

19           that we don't even know about. But by the  
20           same token because of that, it is  
21           something that you are going to have to  
22           consider very carefully -- I'm not going  
23           to come down on one side or the other as  
24           far as the development of which one goes  
25           and which one shouldn't be because that is

1 your job, but I do say it is something  
2 that has to be taken with great caution.  
3 Thank you.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Other comments? I  
5 think everybody in the room has spoken.  
6 So I'm looking around here, more questions  
7 for the developer? I mean for the  
8 applicant? Comments? What is your  
9 pleasure? What do you want to do?

10 MS. LONGOBARDO: You mean do we  
11 want Marilyn to get up and read all of her  
12 comments to us?

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a  
14 possibility. Let me rephrase the  
15 question. What do we want to do about the  
16 design of the building? Do you want to  
17 talk about it? Do we want to do an  
18 informal vote now? Do you want to put it

19 off? Do you want more drawings? What do

20 you need to decide?

21 MS. LONGOBARDO: A couple of things

22 -- we do have -- that we have an alternate

23 here, I do feel badly with John

24 Westerfield in China, but he has been part

25 in parcel of this whole discussion from

1 the start so I think he should be here for  
2 the vote. So for that reason alone, I  
3 would think we should postpone.

4 In a more general basic way, for  
5 myself, I'm very affected -- I am not  
6 saying which way I will vote, but I'm very  
7 affected by the thought of having the  
8 openness at the street corners and having  
9 a fairly large park even though it is  
10 mostly going to be used by the residents  
11 in that building and it is still an  
12 openness and so-on. But I think I require  
13 more discussion and I don't necessarily --  
14 I think it is wonderful that the public  
15 gets up and makes these comments, but in  
16 addition, by John's presenting to us more  
17 stuff, I know he is not going to go down  
18 to the end degree if we are not picking

19           that alternate, but I think it is a  
20           helpful tool for me to have some more  
21           discussion about it.

22                   MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we --  
23           Adrienne?

24                   MS. SMITH: I agree totally.

25                   MR. CHAIRMAN: Erik, do you have a

1 --

2 MR. BLESSING: I totally agree with  
3 that. I would like to see -- tonight  
4 we've only shown the one building design,  
5 that is all we've talked about, and I  
6 think in fairness, we should have in  
7 essence, duplicate drawings of each one we  
8 are comparing apples to apples. We have a  
9 rendering or a photograph montage of one  
10 building and we should have the exact same  
11 thing for the two buildings. We should  
12 compare apples to apples and then upon  
13 hearing the comments from the general  
14 public I think with that, I would probably  
15 have enough information to vote one way or  
16 the another.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is your thought that  
18 you want all three designs or two designs?

19 MR. BLESSING: I was thinking  
20 merely the two designs. The two building  
21 with the Tudor and the Mission and the  
22 single Mission style building.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: We will give the  
24 applicants -- maybe we can make them a  
25 list of what we want. Do we have any more

1 specific thoughts? Anna, you wanted one  
2 of the photographs?

3 MS. LONGOBARDO: Of that John. As  
4 you go past that turn around, but I think  
5 John was planning on doing this for us  
6 anyway.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just trying to  
8 make a list.

9 MS. SMITH: But again, it's  
10 parallel as possible in terms of --

11 MR. BLESSING: Here we seem to have  
12 been leaning and being somewhat pushed  
13 towards the one building design because  
14 that is the only thing we have been  
15 talking about. The last time it was much  
16 more balanced. You had specifically said  
17 you thought one of the greatest things  
18 that could ever happen were having the two

19 different ones which someone came up and  
20 say oh gee, look at those, there was no  
21 way they could have been developed at the  
22 same time.

23 MR. SULLIVAN: The same could of  
24 happened with this one now.

25 MR. BLESSING: One on one, I think

1 that is a little hard. But I just think  
2 when you say that so, I would like to just  
3 see everything balanced, you know. If you  
4 have 10 schematics of one and then you  
5 have 10 of the other, it would be exactly  
6 the same thing. We hear comments from  
7 other people and maybe be off to a race so  
8 to speak.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: I think it is a fair  
10 request particularly right here. Which by  
11 the way, there will be -- although not  
12 illustrated in this photograph montage or  
13 on the Site Plan underneath, but there are  
14 some site approval that will be to that  
15 traffic circulation area that we were just  
16 discussing by the way that are not  
17 illustrated here.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: We meet again in

19           about two weeks, do you think you can have  
20           that stuff together by then?

21                   MR. SULLIVAN: I would think so.

22                   MR. CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to get  
23           a sense of where we are going. Do we  
24           think looking around here, do we think if  
25           he can came back with that and we look at

Proceedings 110

1 it, is it our expectation that we are  
2 going to decide at the October meeting?

3 MR. BLESSING: Yeah, I think that  
4 would.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: Fair enough. We  
7 will attempt next time to do that and we  
8 will do that, not attempt.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So it is  
10 already pretty late and I take it that the  
11 sentiment is we don't want to start on the  
12 text. I would ask you -- do you have --  
13 we do have a long comment letter from the  
14 Park's Association, do you have that?

15 MR. MILLER: Yes, we do.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have to  
17 somehow enter that on the record? Is on  
18 the record?

19 MR. STAUDT: Just by it's having  
20 been submitted now, it is part of the  
21 hearing process and it would have to be  
22 responded to in the FEIS.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: I will point out  
24 that and I think John had pointed out  
25 earlier that this comment letter from

1 Metro North says they have some concerns  
2 about storm water, draining, about  
3 blasting, about the potential closing of  
4 the northbound platform and I don't see  
5 that I brought it with me, but there are  
6 two letters that we got from Westchester  
7 County. One is addressing environmental  
8 matters and the other, I can't remember  
9 what it addressed but --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: From the  
11 Health Department.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, those were  
13 environmental oriented which need to be  
14 addressed.

15 MS. LONGOBARDO: The one from the  
16 Health Department is actually pointing out  
17 an error I think more or less.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid we are

19           probably going to have a lot on the  
20           October meeting also, but let's try to if  
21           we can target and do this and see if we  
22           can get through the DEIS next time and  
23           wind it up.

24                   MR. STAUDT: You will adjourn the  
25           hearing on the DEIS and the Site Plan to a

1 date and time specific.

2 MS. LONGOBARDO: It is the 12th.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: We are adjourning

4 the DEIS and the Site Plan application

5 hearings until the 12th of October.

6 MR. STAUDT: At 730 p.m..

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is the

8 public hearing still open?

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. A

10 motion to adjourn?

11 MS. SMITH: So adjourned.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: A second?

13 MR. BLESSING: Second.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

15 (Whereupon, the Board voted

16 unanimously in favor.)

17 (Time noted 10:03 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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