

Planning Board
Village of Tarrytown
Regular Meeting
June 27, 2022 7 pm

PRESENT: Chair Raiselis; Members Friedlander, Aukland, Gaito, Mendez Boyer;
Alternate Member Mezey, Counsel Zalantis; Village Engineer Pennella;
Village Planner Galvin; Secretary Meszaros.

Chair Raiselis called the meeting to order and announced that the public will be given the opportunity to address the Board on agenda items only. Each speaker will be given 3 minutes during the public comment period. The Board welcomes public written comments emailed to imeszaros@tarrytowngov.com or mailed to the Village of Tarrytown, Planning Dept. - 1 Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, NY 10591, and should be received no later than the Friday before the meeting, in order to be distributed in advance of the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 23, 2022

Mr. Aukland moved, seconded by Mr. Gaito, with Ms. Mezey abstaining, to approve the minutes of the May 23, 2022 meeting, as submitted.

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Aukland: Yes
Member Friedlander: Yes
Member Gaito: Yes
Chair Raiselis: Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 4-0

NEW BOARD MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENT

Ms. Raiselis welcomed Judith Mezey as a new Alternate Planning Board Member, appointed by the Board of Trustees on June 21, 2022.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – Theodora Pouloutides – 59 N. Washington Street

Ms. Raiselis read the following public hearing notice into the record:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Planning Board of the Village of Tarrytown will hold a public hearing on **Monday, June 27, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.** at the Municipal Building, One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, New York to consider an application by:

Theodora Pouloutides
6 Bracken Road
Ossining, NY 10562

To request a two (2) year extension of the site plan approval granted by the Planning Board on August 24, 2020 to permit a fifth dwelling unit in the basement of an existing residence.

The property is located at 59 N. Washington Street and is shown on the Tax Maps of the Village of Tarrytown as Sheet 1.40, Block 12, Lot 3, and is located in the M-1.5 Zoning District.

Documents are available for inspection in the Planning and Zoning Office. All interested parties are invited to attend and be heard. Access to the meeting room is available to the elderly and the handicapped. Signing is available for the hearing-impaired; request must be made to the Village Clerk at least one week in advance of the meeting.

By Order of the Planning Board

Lizabeth Meszaros
Secretary to the Planning Board
Dated: June 17, 2022

The mailing receipts were received and the property sign was posted.

Taylor Palmer, ESQ., partner with the Law Firm of Cuddy & Feder, appeared before the Board on behalf of the owner, Theodora Pouloutides, to request for a 2-year extension to the original site plan approval granted by this Board on August 24, 2020. He advised that the owner has been diligently working towards getting construction plans submitted to the building department, which includes a fire sprinkler plan required to convert the 4 units to 5 units. Unfortunately, the architect that had been working on the project retired and had left his client in a position to hire a new architect. A new architect has been retained to help refine and update the plans so that they can be submitted to the Building Department. He advised that the Zoning Board had approved a 2-year extension of the area variances at their June 13, 2022 meeting with a specific condition that the applicant must promptly allow the building department complete access to the property and each structure on the property to inspect for any unsafe or illegal conditions resulting from the applicant's failure to obtain a building permit within the allotted time. Mr. Palmer said that he has no objection to this Board having a similar condition.

Ms. Raiselis asked Mr. Pennella to comment on this application.

Mr. Pennella said to date, no work has been done to the unit at all and there are concerns from a safety perspective. He clarified that the Mr. Palmer just mentioned that the Zoning Board granted a 2-year extension but it was actually an 18-month extension with a condition for the building department to perform a safety/fire inspection since they have not been in

the building since 2020. They have not received a call yet. Mr. Palmer said they have not objected to the building department coming to the property and they are welcomed to do so.

Mr. Gaito asked Mr. Pennella what the process is to have an inspection.

Mr. Pennella said it is up to the applicant to call and schedule an inspection to make sure the smoke alarms are installed correctly and in the proper locations, as well as the existing electrical outlets, which will require an electrical certification.

Mr. Gaito asked why the applicant had not scheduled this work within the past 2 years.

Mr. Palmer advised that it was first identified that the fifth unit was not legal when the building department did a fire inspection a couple of years ago, which triggered a site plan review. They now understand that they should make the request. He apologized on behalf of the applicant and will make a direct request to the Building Department. Mr. Pennella clarified that the fire inspection is for the common areas only so that does not mean that they went into the apartment. Mr. Palmer did not believe this was a requirement in the original approval. Mr. Pennella advised that it was noted throughout the meetings that inspections would be required and that the expectation was that the work would commence in an expeditious manner for the safety of the tenants.

Mr. Palmer explained that there were unique circumstances and they have a new architect. The applicant has incurred a significant expense and is moving through the process and understands the expediency.

Mr. Pennella advised that the electrical permit can be filed separately from the Building Permit. The work can then be done and inspected by a third party to test the outlets and ensure that the wiring is correct for the safety of the tenants.

Mr. Galvin advised that he drafted a Resolution to grant the applicant a one-year extension from the date of this meeting, to expire on June 27, 2023, based on conversations with the Building Inspector, as discussed at the work session. Mr. Pennella would like the electrical work expedited for life safety issues.

Ms. Raiselis asked if the Board had any other questions.

Mr. Aukland asked the applicant if there have been any changes at all since the 2020 approval. Mr. Palmer said there is no change in circumstance since the original approval.

Mr. Aukland asked Mr. Pennella if anything has changed from the Village's point of view, with regard to code standards, that would require the Board to re-examine this application.

Mr. Pennella advised that nothing has changed; the sprinkler system will be installed in the common areas and basement unit and the electrical work will be done and inspected for safety.

Dr. Friedlander moved, seconded by Mr. Gaito, to open the public hearing.

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Gaito:	Yes
Member Friedlander:	Yes
Member Aukland:	Yes
Chair Raiselis:	Yes
Member Mendez-Boyer:	Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0

Ms. Raiselis asked if anyone in the public would like to comment on this application.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

John Loja appeared and stated that he lives behind this property. He is planning to do some work on his wall. He wants to make sure that the applicant will be doing the work that was required in the original approval and is willing to work with the applicant toward a solution.

Mr. Pennella explained that the applicant will be required to do the curb work to alleviate the drainage onto Mr. Loja's property which was part of the original approval. Mr. Pennella advised Mr. Loja that if he wants to fix his wall in conjunction with this work, he will have to coordinate that with the applicant.

Mr. Loja briefly discussed some other concerns about drainage coming onto his property from other properties. Mr. Pennella advised that he can file a complaint about the other properties and he will follow up with him, but this application is specifically for 59 N. Washington Street. Ms. Raiselis also suggested that Mr. Loja call Mr. Pennella and discuss his concerns. Mr. Loja thanked the Board for listening.

END OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Dr. Friedlander moved, seconded by Mr. Gaito, to close the public hearing.

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Gaito:	Yes
Member Friedlander:	Yes
Member Aukland:	Yes
Chair Raiselis:	Yes
Member Mendez-Boyer:	Yes
All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0	

Mr. Gaito read through portions of the draft Resolution. A copy will be provided to the applicant and the entire Resolution will be recorded in the minutes of this meeting as follows:

RESOLUTION
VILLAGE OF TARRYTOWN PLANNING BOARD
(Adopted June 27, 2022)

Application of Theodora Pouloutides
Property: 59 North Washington Street (Sheet 1.40, Block 12, Lot 3, and M-1.5 Zone)

Resolution for Extension of Site Plan Approval
Background

1. The Applicant has requested a two-year extension of the Site Plan approval originally granted by the Planning Board on August 24, 2020, for the legalization of a fifth dwelling unit in the basement of an existing residence at 59 North Washington Street in the M-1.5 (Multi-Family) District. The current site plan approval is scheduled to expire on August 24, 2022. The requested two-year extension would extend the site plan approval to August 24, 2024.

2. The Planning Board determined the proposed action to be an unlisted action under SEQRA and assumed lead agency status on April 27, 2020, and issued a Negative Declaration for the proposed unlisted action on May 27, 2020.

3. The Planning Board has conducted a duly noticed public hearing on June 27, 2022, at which time all those wishing to be heard were given the opportunity to be heard.

4. The Applicant's Attorney from Cuddy & Feder has indicated in a letter dated May 12, 2022, that the applicant is proposing various building code renovations shown generally on the previously approved plan set. Applicant is also aware that the installation of sprinklers has been determined to be required by the Building Department. The Applicant is requesting this extension to allow time to secure a building permit for the approved improvements. Additionally, the Applicant has been further delayed by the retirement of the Applicant's architect prior to completion of the necessary plans as well as other delays related to the pandemic. The Planning Board has carefully considered the Applicant's letter, the Zoning Board of Appeals resolution dated June 13, 2022, work session memorandum from the Consulting Village Planner dated 6/12/22 and reviewed the extent of the remaining work with the Village Engineer/Building Inspector, which the Planning Board has considered.

5. On June 13, 2022, the Zoning Board of Appeals reviewed the Applicant's request to extend certain area variances to allow the legalization of the fifth dwelling unit in the basement at 59 North Washington Street. The Zoning Board of Appeals emphasized that the Applicant must make every concerted and prompt effort to do the work necessary and authorized by the granting of the variances to bring the Property into compliance with all applicable codes and laws. The Zoning Board of Appeals closed the public hearing on June 13, 2022, and approved the extension for a period of 18 months expiring on December 13, 2023. The Zoning Board of Appeals added a site safety inspection condition requiring the Applicant to allow the Building

Department prompt access to the property to inspect for any unsafe and/or illegal conditions resulting from Applicant's failure to obtain a building permit within the time allotted by the ZBA Resolution.

6. The Planning Board closed their public hearing on June 27, 2022. After closing the public hearing, the Planning Board deliberated in public on the Applicant's request for approval.

Determination

The Planning Board has considered the remaining work to be completed and the need to promptly bring the property into compliance with all applicable building and fire codes. Based on these factors, the Planning Board determines that the site plan extension is granted for a period of one (1) year from the date of this Resolution, to expire on June 27, 2023.

The Planning Board approval is granted subject to the following general conditions and specific conditions set forth below:

I. General Conditions

1. **Prerequisites to Signing Site Plan:** The following conditions must be met before the Planning Board Chair may sign the approved Site Plan ("Final Site Plan"):
 - i. The Planning Board's approval is conditioned upon Applicant receiving all approvals required by other governmental approving agencies without material deviation from the Approved Plans.
 - ii. If as a condition to approval any changes are required to the Approved Plans, the Applicant shall submit: (i) final plans complying with all requirements and conditions of this Resolution, and (ii) a check list summary indicating how the final plans comply with all requirements of this Resolution. If said final plans comply with all the requirements of this Resolution as determined by the Village Engineer, they shall also be considered "Approved Plans."
 - iii. The Applicant shall pay all outstanding consultant review and legal fees in connection with the Planning Board review of this Application.
2. **Force and Effect:** No portion of any approval by the Planning Board shall take effect until (1) all conditions are met, (2) the Final Site Plan is signed by the Chair of the Planning Board and (3) the Final Site Plan signed by the Planning Board Chair has been filed with the Village Clerk
3. **Field Changes:** In the event the Village Engineer/Building Inspector agrees that, as a result of conditions in the field, field changes are necessary to complete the work authorized by the Approved Plans and deems such changes to be minor, the Village Engineer/Building

Inspector may, allow such changes, subject to any applicable amendment to the approved building permit(s). If not deemed minor, any deviation from or change in the Approved Plans shall require application to the Planning Board for amendment of this approval. In all cases, amended plans shall be submitted to reflect approved field changes.

4. Commencing Work: No work may be commenced on any portion of the site without first contacting the Building Inspector to ensure that all permits and approvals have been obtained and to establish an inspection schedule. **Failure to comply with this provision shall result in the immediate revocation of all permits** issued by the Village along with the requirement to reapply (including the payment of application fees) for all such permits, the removal of all work performed and restoration to its original condition of any portion of the site disturbed and such other and additional civil and criminal penalties as the courts may impose.

IV. Specific Conditions

- a) Applicant shall file and obtain an electrical permit with the Building Department and have the work inspected for compliance within six (6) months from the date of this Resolution, but no later than December 27, 2022.

Mr. Pennella read the Determination in the Resolution out loud for clarification as follows:

“The Planning Board has considered the remaining work to be completed and the need to promptly bring the property into compliance with all applicable building and fire codes. Based on these factors, the Planning Board determines that the site plan extension is granted for a period of one (1) year from the date of this Resolution, to expire on June 27, 2023.”

Mr. Aukland moved, seconded by Dr. Friedlander, to approve this Resolution, granting a one (1) year extension with the conditions as set for the in this Resolution, to expire on June 27, 2023.

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Gaito:	Yes
Member Friedlander:	Yes
Member Aukland:	Yes
Chair Raiselis:	Yes
Member Mendez-Boyer:	Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – Mercy College, 828-832 South Broadway

Ms. Raiselis read the following public hearing notice into the record:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Planning Board of the Village of Tarrytown will hold a public hearing on **Monday, June 27, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.** at the Municipal Building, One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, New York to consider an application by:

Mercy College
555 South Broadway
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522

For site plan approval for the expansion of parking lot areas to add an additional 83 parking spaces with related infrastructure improvements.

The property is located at 828-832 South Broadway and is shown on the Tax Maps of the Village of Tarrytown as Sheet 1.260, Block 135, Lot 1 and is located in the OB Zoning District.

Documents are available for inspection in the Planning and Zoning Office. All interested parties are invited to attend and be heard. Access to the meeting room is available to the elderly and the handicapped. Signing is available for the hearing-impaired; request must be made to the Village Clerk at least one week in advance of the meeting.

Additional approval will be required by the Zoning Board, the Architectural Review Board and the Board of Trustees.

By Order of the Planning Board

Lizabeth Meszaros
Secretary to the Planning Board
Dated: June 17, 2022

The mailing receipts were received and the property signs were posted.

Darius P. Chafizadeh, Attorney, with the law firm of Harris Beach, PLLC, appeared, representing Mercy College. He introduced Thomas Simmonds, Vice President of Operations at Mercy College, who will give a short presentation about the history and use of the property at 828 South Broadway, and Mike Bellack, Sr. Engineer, with Foyt-Albert Associates, who is available to answer any questions about the plan.

Mr. Chafizadeh distributed 4 sheets to the Board and staff, showing existing conditions, proposed conditions, a lighting plan, and a rendering of the proposed new sign at the entrance. The project consists of rehabilitating the parking lots, improving the stormwater drainage, adding sidewalk and lighting, and additional parking. There are currently 114 parking spaces, not including the “Make a Wish” area. They plan to add additional spaces to

bring the number up to 197 parking spaces. He showed the three existing buildings on site and the deficiencies with regard to the current traffic flow and accessibility. The proposed improvements will create better flow and access to the 47,000 s.f. office building, the Moller House, and the “Make A Wish” Cottage building. As you enter from the south, there will be an option to access the parking area or continue straight up to a new turnaround area with access to the parking lots for the Moller House and the Cottage. He added that the proposed exterior site improvements will not change the existing program at the campus. They are not adding any employees or any workspace. He introduced Thomas Simmonds, Vice President of Operations, to provide details about Mercy College and the use at this property.

Mr. Simmonds explained that the College rented this property from Diamond Properties, for a period of three years prior to purchasing it in 2019, at which time, they closed their Yorktown office location. They renewed the lease with the “Make A Wish” foundation at that time and continue to lease the property to them, as they continue to do good work for the community. When they purchased the building in 2019, there were still a number of tenants in the Moller House. Over the years they have not renewed any tenant leases, instead, they have worked with the Building Department to renovate the building for their use. They currently use the Moller House as their Alumni/Public Affairs Center for Mercy and the former College of New Rochelle. There are some Marketing Department offices upstairs and a conference room on the first floor with public space for people to meet, but not much activity goes on. With regard to the existing office building, there is only one tenant remaining, who occupies the lowest level. Their lease runs out in December, and it will not be renewed. The office building houses the finance department, Institutional Research offices, and financial aid offices. The upper level houses the IT group and has a training room which holds up to 45 people and is primarily used for staff development with no intention to have classes. The use is for back offices which supports the Dobbs Ferry campus.

With regard to the parking plan, Mr. Simmonds showed the top parking area by the Moller House and the existing grade which makes it inaccessible to the lower parking lot area. They will be adding a sidewalk and improving this area to get the proper circulation and accessible parking to the Moller House and the Make A Wish building, so that each can better function. He advised that there are no additional spaces being added in the smaller parking lot and showed the area which is up against the neighbor’s property.

He showed the south parking area which has 99 existing spaces. They will re-stripe the area to gain more spaces. They have been required by Irvington and Dobbs Ferry to present a Transportation Demand Management Plan. The purpose of this plan is to limit the number of cars on Route 9. He pointed to where their shuttle fleet is parked. The shuttle program helps to reduce traffic in the area. Students, contractor’s, employees, etc. will park on site and be shuttled to the Dobbs campus, which also frees up parking on that site. They also shuttle to the train on the hour. In addition, Mr. Simmonds noted that they have had

long standing relationships with their neighbors at Shadowbrook, the Walker Estate, and Lyndhurst, who have made requests to park at Mercy when they hold community events. Diamond Properties, the former owner, began this relationship and Mercy continues to accommodate these requests whenever possible. He advised that they have about 200 employees on site. Overall, their parking has worked pretty well and they are probably not in need of additional parking for their primary functions, however, since they are improving the lighting, drainage and stormwater, they also thought it would be a good asset for Mercy, and the community at the south end of town, to add a little bit of additional parking. He noted that they recently received a request from Lyndhurst to use their lot for the Dog Show last week, but they ended up not needing the extra parking.

With regard to the pedestrian flow from Route 9 into this complex, Mr. Simmonds showed an old paved walkway at the corner of the property, which has not been used for many years. He asked if the Board would consider opening up this area, which is close to the bus stop, or if their preference may be to bring them into the wider roadway area.

Mr. Simmonds concluded that the main purpose of this project is to address accessibility, lighting, stormwater, and to add more parking. There will be no more employee growth. They receive parking requests from the neighbors for weekend events, which has not been a problem since there is no one working, but they have had to turn the neighbors down for events during the weekday. These added spaces may help. Lastly, he showed the proposed sign which will require ARB approval which is similar to the sign that will be placed at the Dobbs Ferry Campus.

Mr. Aukland moved, seconded by Dr. Friedlander, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQRA.

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Gaito:	Yes
Member Friedlander:	Yes
Member Aukland:	Yes
Chair Raiselis:	Yes
Member Mendez-Boyer:	Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0

Mr. Aukland moved, seconded by Dr. Friedlander, that the Board declares its intent to act as Lead Agency with proper notification to Involved and Interested agencies and that the application be referred to the Westchester County Planning Department for review under the General Municipal Law.

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Gaito:	Yes
Member Friedlander:	Yes
Member Aukland:	Yes
Chair Raiselis:	Yes
Member Mendez-Boyer:	Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0

Ms. Raiselis read through portions of a letter from the Westchester County Planning Board with recommendations which will be posted on the website in the 828-832 South Broadway Site Plan application document file.

1. Need for additional pedestrian improvements.

While the site plan shows sidewalk improvements connecting the new parking lots to the buildings on the site, there is no sidewalk or pedestrian access between any buildings on the site and Broadway. If the applicant envisions more activity on the site to the extent where more parking is needed, the applicant should also be making it easier for people to get to and from the site utilizing the Bee-Line bus stops located at the intersection of Broadway and Sunnyside Lane. We point out that these bus stops are for the same bus route (Route 1) that also stops in front of the main Mercy College campus in Dobbs Ferry.

Therefore, since it is likely that a portion of the site's users will want to use this bus service, the site plan should be revised to include sidewalks that connect to this intersection. Intersection upgrades, such as crosswalks or pedestrian signals may also be needed, and the Village and the applicant should work with NYS DOT to implement any needed improvements.

2. Bicycle and electric vehicle parking.

The site plans should be revised to include accommodations for bicycle parking. In addition, the Village and the applicant should give consideration towards the provision of electric vehicle parking capabilities on the site.

3. Solar canopies.

We encourage the applicant to consider the use of solar canopies over the proposed parking areas. We point out that such installations are becoming more common on campus properties in Westchester County.

Ms. Raiselis asked the Board Members if they had any questions or comments.

Dr. Friedlander was surprised by the number of employees currently working on site. He asked Mr. Simmonds how many cars use the site each day. Mr. Simmonds said that the existing parking is sometimes full, but not very often. They have 114 existing spaces.

Dr. Friedlander commented that the lot is not very full whenever he drives by.

Ms. Raiselis asked for actual data of the number that come in, at what times, when it is full, and how the vehicles and pedestrians are using the site. Ms. Raiselis understands that they are being good neighbors, but she asked Mr. Simmonds if the purpose of adding the additional parking is to accommodate other entities. Mr. Simmonds say that they park their fleet in this area since they treat this for back offices.

Mr. Chafizadeh showed the traffic circulation pattern and the lots. They are adding 40 spots on the Sunnyside Lane side. The other lot will add 38 to bring them up to 53 spaces.

Mr. Pennella said the plans were not 100% clear, which is what prompted the Denial Letter. Mr. Pennella would like to see a traffic analysis prepared since they are no longer a tenant but own the property. They have 128 spaces on site and are proposing 212, which is an addition of 84 spaces. He noted that the spaces are currently angled and the reconfiguration of the spaces will be a benefit as well as the stormwater improvements. The denial letter that was issued was based on the initial plans submitted. He also noted that there are no planting beds/islands in the plan, which would either require a variance, or a plan revision to include them.

With regard to the access pathways, Ms. Raiselis would like the plan revised so that pedestrians do not have to walk in a lane of traffic to get to their cars. She would like a clear path in the middle or planting areas proposed with a pedestrian walk.

Ms. Mendez Boyer would also like to see a traffic analysis for the parking. Mr. Simmonds confirmed that they will not be leasing any spaces to the other institutions. Mr. Chafizadeh noted that the other institution uses are intermittent uses and they do it to be good neighbors, but they will look at it and see if they can take out some parking out, the southwest row, in particular.

Ms. Raiselis said it seems that paving the lot for additional spaces that are not needed is also not good for stormwater management.

Mike Bellack, the project engineer, briefly went over the stormwater plan and showed the areas where the water will be collected and brought to bioretention areas (rain gardens) to better collect and distribute it. Mr. Pennella asked if they are collecting the entire parking lot. He said yes and there may be a net benefit and he will provide that number. He noted that the modern treatment system they are using is more natural. With regard to the pedestrian access, if they add that in, they will lose a significant number of parking spaces.

They wanted to keep the two-way parking flow and only re-stripe the lot. They also needed to make sure that the ADA is easily accessible and to code, which they have confirmed.

Ms. Raiselis said the current ADA plan has pedestrians crossing a vehicular way to get to the buildings. Mr. Bellack said that may be due to the grades which may not be able to accommodate the ADA code. Ms. Raiselis believes that this plan gives the car priority over the people and pedestrian safety is more important than the parking. She feels that there needs to be a compromise. Mr. Bellack said he will look at the grades again, and if they allow, they will revisit the location of the ADA parking. Mr. Chafizadeh said they are certainly not anti-pedestrian and will consider these comments.

Mr. Gaito commented that the north side parking lot looks good but maybe the overflow does not have to be paved. He too would like a parking analysis of existing vs. proposed which will determine which way they should go. Good design principles require that pedestrians do not cross over vehicular lanes whenever possible. This plan requires more pedestrian safety. At this point, it is hard to say what works and what doesn't without the parking data.

Mr. Chafizadeh said they are not changing the program. It has been office space for as long as he can remember. They are only changing the circulation and parking to make it more accessible. All the parking and layouts were already approved. They understand the ADA access concerns and will look into that.

Mr. Gaito would like the parking data. Mr. Chafizadeh feels like the Board is treating this like a new building. There are no program changes and the plan has worked. Ms. Mendez-Boyer said if you are adding more parking, the Board needs to understand why. They need to see how many shuttles they have, and consider the benefits to the neighbors. They commend shared parking but would like it to be existing parking, not by adding more surface area. Mr. Chafizadeh advised that the stormwater numbers are included in the SWPPP.

Mr. Aukland wants to know about the left turns out of the main entrance. Mr. Chafizadeh said it is existing and won't change. They are not changing anything. They will provide the information and, at peak times, but it is less than what was before.

Ms. Raiselis said you are asking for more parking and the Board has concerns about the need and overall safety. The Board needs a more complete picture in order to make any determination.

Mr. Aukland is comforted that the program is not changing but he wants to be sure the parking is not changing. And if that is the case, he would like them to show the numbers.

Mr. Pennella referenced the Zoning Code §305-63 – Parking Requirements, which provides information to do a parking analysis. This is a baseline and the data are needed.

Mr. Aukland wants to ensure that the traffic on Broadway will not change and he wants to see that data.

Mr. Gaito asked Mr. Simmonds about the shuttles.

Mr. Simmonds said the shuttle runs to the train on the hour. They try to eliminate as many single occupancy vehicles as possible and encourage public transportation. They are willing to give up some of the new parking if it causes more problems than it is worth, but they feel that it is in the best interest to add more parking at the same time they are doing these improvements. He explained that before COVID, the lots were full, and he is hoping to get everyone back. They feel that adding one row where the dead tree is not a big deal and it would be beneficial for the community as well. They will also look at the walkway out to the corner of E. Sunnyside Lane.

Ms. Raiselis would like to schedule a site visit.

Mr. Chafizadeh said they just want to add parking, fix the stormwater, provide pedestrian access from the bus stop. They don't want to go back to point zero and start looking at traffic turning left out of the site. There are 200 potential employees that could turn left and it has worked for 30 years or more. It is not been an issue in the past and it has not been an issue since Mercy has owned the property. The employees work times are staggered. This is an existing functional building. Mr. Galvin commented that the data they submit is going to show that.

Ms. Raiselis said they are not asking the applicant to go back to point zero but 83 parking spaces is not a few parking spaces, to be realistic. There is a SEQRA review which requires that this data be submitted. It is the job of the Planning Board to review the data to determine impacts. You are asking us to not look at the data. She would like the applicant to work with the Board and submit data so that they can make a decision. Mr. Galvin commented that parking can be treated differently in terms of paving, gravel or grass.

Dr. Friedlander said the problem is not the number of spaces but the traffic that it could generate. Currently, it does not seem to be a problem, but if the spaces are filled, it may be a problem. When he drives back and forth from Irvington, the traffic is very difficult at 8 a.m., and it has only gotten worse over the years. If the employees are staggered that would be less impactful. The worst-case scenario is having 212 cars leave and arrive at the same time as the buses.

Mr. Chafizadeh said they will look at this and provide data for the peak hours as well.

Mr. Simmonds commented that "Make a Wish" and the "Alumni Group" would like to have 10 to 15 spots available to them for people who drop in and out during the day. Part of what they are trying to do is dedicate spaces for their visitors. The functions there will not get bigger. They will label the spaces on the plan to show that visitor use.

Ms. Raiselis said it is completely reasonable to have visitor parking.

Dr. Friedlander said these are the types of explanations that are helpful in their determination. He is worried about full capacity with the additional spaces and not knowing how it may impact the traffic. Mr. Chafizadeh said the use is for general office and they will provide a parking analysis.

Ms. Raiselis asked them to consider Westchester County's Planning comments regarding bicycle racks, pedestrian access, solar canopies, and EV charging stations.

Mr. Simmonds said they have reviewed the solar canopies and they are not feasible. He will share that information at the next meeting. He advised that they are working with NYSEERDA for electric vehicle charging stations and bicycle access and Mr. Chafizadeh they will look at pedestrian access from Broadway at the corner of Sunnyside and Broadway.

Ms. Raiselis asked if anyone in the public would like to speak. No one appeared.

Mr. Aukland commented that the lighting plan submitted looks good. He noted that Mr. Pennella will review the stormwater plan. Mr. Pennella confirmed that there are no steep slopes. A planting plan will be submitted for review and they are planning on removing one dead tree.

Ms. Raiselis would also like to schedule a site visit. She asked Ms. Meszaros to make arrangements with the applicant.

Mr. Aukland moved, seconded by Mr. Gaito, to set an escrow at \$10,000.00.

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Gaito:	Yes
Member Friedlander:	Yes
Member Aukland:	Yes
Chair Raiselis:	Yes
Member Mendez-Boyer:	Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0

Ms. Mendez-Boyer asked for a little more information about the Transportation Demand Management Plan. Mr. Simmonds said they re-submitted a plan about 5 to 6 years ago and they have been trying to increase the number of people using public transportation over the years. It will need to be updated. Currently, about 20% of their population comes by train. They are trying to minimize the number of cars on the Dobbs Ferry campus.

Mr. Aukland moved, seconded by Dr. Friedlander, to continue the public hearing.

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Gaito:	Yes
Member Friedlander:	Yes
Member Aukland:	Yes
Chair Raiselis:	Yes
Member Mendez-Boyer:	Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Aukland moved, seconded by Dr. Friedlander, to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m.
All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0

Ms. Raiselis asked for a roll call vote:

Member Gaito:	Yes
Member Friedlander:	Yes
Member Aukland:	Yes
Chair Raiselis:	Yes
Member Mendez-Boyer:	Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 5-0

Liz Meszaros – Secretary