

Planning Board
Village of Tarrytown
Special Work Session – Realty @ 460 SB LLC a/k/a Honda
August 31, 2016; 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Friedlander; Members Tedesco, Birgy, Raiselis; Village Engineer Pennella; Counsel Zalantis; Village Planner Galvin; Secretary Meszaros

ABSENT: Member Aukland

Chairman Friedlander called the work session to order at 7:02 pm and made a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss procedural issues with counsel.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Raiselis, to go into an Executive Session to discuss procedural issues with counsel. All in favor; motion carried.

Mr. Tedesco, moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis to adjourn the Executive Session. All in favor; motion carried.

Discussion – Realty@ 460 SB LLC

John J. Hughes, Attorney for applicant, introduced his team, John Manilio, PE, Craig Zimmerman, PE, of Redcom Engineering, Jack Ryan, VP of Operations for Honda, and John Collins, of Maser Consulting, the applicant's traffic consultant.

Mr. Hughes thought it would be helpful to go over zoning criteria to help the Board in its decision; however, Chairman Friedlander said that the zoning criteria is part of the Zoning Board process and not for the Planning Board to be involved with.

Mr. Hughes introduced John Manilio, PE, to discuss the size of the structure and alternative configurations as requested by the Board at the July 25, 2016 meeting. Mr. Manilio presented the revised July 25th power point presentation without the landscaping to allow for a full view of the building.

The next rendering he presented was of the second story concept with the service shop on the second floor, also without the landscaping. He explained that the height of the building had to be raised from 28 feet to 38 feet since 19 feet per floor is needed.

He then showed a rendering comparing both sites without the landscaping.

Mr. Birgy stated that the Board wanted them to mitigate the impact of having a large footprint one story building with a smaller footprint 2 story building. All they did was add a second story onto the existing building.

Mr. Manilio asked to be able to explain the differences to the plan. He showed the 2 story floor plan that would require a ramp installation. He explained that the width of the ramp is one way (7 feet) but you need room for turning radius so the building has gotten 4 feet fatter with the ramp.

Mr. Birgy said to put a ramp in is a waste of time. The Board asked for a plan that makes sense to both the applicant and village.

Chairman Friedlander asked about the second floor plan.

Mr. Manilio said that the only way to reduce the footprint would be to move customer waiting to the second floor. He referenced the elevator for car lifts which was suggested at the last meeting but explained that it is inefficient for this business since elevators do break down often.

Ms. Raiselis asked the difference between square footage from this plan vs. the July plan. Mr. Manilio said the new plan is 21,650 SF vs. 20,907 SF.

Ms. Raiselis asked Mr. Manilio what the setback from the curb line to the front to overhead doors is. Mr. Manilio said about 80 feet (or 4 cars), and it is about 59 feet to the front corner of the building.

Planner Galvin went through his memo in detail. In summary, he said the traffic study looked good. The architectural renderings are the ARB jurisdiction and will be helpful to them. He reviewed the concept plan dated 8-19-16 in response to comments from the Board that they wanted to see a ramp plan. The plan reduced the front setback by 4 feet and the pavement area is reduced from 24 feet to 20 feet; but the concept plan does not reduce the footprint, which is 21,650 SF.

Planner Galvin concluded that most of the issues with regard to SEQRA have been addressed by the applicant. He recommended that the Board provide the applicant with a standard for the setback along South Broadway and then move forward with a Negative Declaration if the Board comes to agreement. He added that perhaps the applicant can square off front of building and move the building back. The additional pavement in the front may help with future queuing issues and also provide green space in front of the building.

Chairman Friedlander asked the Board to comment on Mr. Galvin's memo.

Mr. Tedesco is positive about Mr. Galvin's recommendation. It provides a rationale in a sense to provide a decent setback in line with the other sites. Mr. Tedesco thinks pushing it back another 10 feet is reasonable.

Chairman Friedlander asked about the cars in the back. Mr. Manilio said they are 33 spaces stacked would be 66. Mr. Manilio said the spaces are for employees, customer

parking and for service inventory. Mr. Manilio said that the building could be moved back another 2 feet.

Ms. Raiselis offered her rationale for the setback. She asked the Board to look at the entire block. She feels that the setback is pretty collinear to what the applicant is proposing and is already further back than most of the properties. Mavis is 50 feet and the gas station is 60 feet. She feels it is consistent with the block and it functions for the applicant, and the applicant has shrunk the plan down to the minimum of what they can do.

Chairman Friedlander said it is consistent with the block but the reason for the 100 foot setback is for increased space and visibility and aesthetics. The neighborhood is called the south-end and extends from 119 all the way to Sunnyside Lane. He feels that the Board needs a rationale for the setback taking into consideration what works with the business and what is consistent with the entire neighborhood, not just the immediate surrounding area.

Mr. Tedesco said that one part of the rationale is that this is a new application but it is not a new business in town. It is part of the Honda operation in the village.

Mr. Hughes said that it seems that what the Board is discussing has to do with the character of the area and this is criteria for the Zoning Board. The bend and flexibility in the code is something to be considered by the Zoning Board. Mr. Hughes feels that this is much more of a zoning case rather than planning case. Mr. Hughes said we have been at this for a long time. He would like to get the variances and then see if any other safety issues come up.

Counsel Zalantis said that Planning Board is Lead Agency for this application, and it is the Board's obligation to look at community impacts, and part of the rationale for the setback increase is to allow more area for queuing to mitigate traffic impacts. These issues are all tied together and there is an overlap of environmental issues.

Chairman Friedlander stated that he has always made reference and raised concern about traffic impacts.

Mr. Hughes said we have had the best traffic experts determine that there are no traffic concerns and Mr. Ryan can go over the business model if the Board wishes. With regard to demand, he said they need the bays and can demonstrate the current demand, and that future growth will consume all of the bays proposed.

Mr. Birgy agrees that this is an historic area and he thinks we have to look at it further. He doesn't understand how we have gotten where we are. There is a steady chipping away of people coming in with oversized proposals. This is another example of something that doesn't fit so well and the Board is looking for alternatives to make it work.

Chairman Friedlander said we need to make a decision to move ahead. Counsel Zalantis said she could prepare a negative declaration if the Board is so inclined to be presented at the next public meeting.

Chairman Friedlander said he would like David Aukland, who is absent this evening, to be involved in this process and get his opinion on the Negative Declaration which will be discussed at the next work session.

John Manilio went over the site plan progression again for Mr. Birgy as requested by Counsel Zalantis to explain how they have made changes to the plan since the beginning.

Mr. Tedesco said they have made some mitigations and it is the Zoning Board's job to make their decisions on the variances. Ms. Raiselis said that the Zoning Board has a good understanding of this application.

Counsel Zalantis asked if they could push the property back. Mr. Manilio said they could push it back and get another 4 or 5 feet.

A conversation ensued between Chairman Friedlander regarding the status of the existing dealership with used cars. Mr. Hughes offered to have Mr. Ryan go over the business plan again. This business has unique benefit for the village. The current facility cannot handle the demand now and the residents are not benefitting. It is a more complex operation; it is a service for families.

Mr. Birgy asked again if there is a way we can minimize the impact on the village.

Mr. Tedesco asked about the possibility of going back and squaring off the building in the front. Mr. Collins, of Maser consulting, said if 8 feet were removed the garage area would have to be moved back to provide 1 car length in front of garage doors. Mr. Galvin said if you moved back 8 feet you can still maintain the 20 foot apron.

Chairman Friedlander asked if the Board had any other comments.

Chairman Friedlander said that the Board will discuss the setback at the next work session and advise the applicant thereafter.

Mr. Birgy moved, seconded by Chairman Friedlander, to close the work session. All in favor. Motion carried. The work session concluded at 8:40 p.m.

Submitted by Liz Meszaros – Secretary to the Planning Board