

**VILLAGE OF TARRYTOWN
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
WORK SESSION 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 2020**

Location: Zoom Video Conference – For Information on How to Join
Visit <https://www.tarrytowngov.com/home/events/31996>
Any questions prior to the meeting may be emailed to administrator@tarrytowngov.com.

Board of Trustee Concerns

Open Session

1. COVID - LOSAP Points Resolution
2. Resolution to Request Payment for Sleepy Hollow Stipulation Projects
3. Silverberg Zalantis Retainer
4. 29 South Depot Plaza – Planning Board Majority and Minority Reports
5. Miller Park Traffic Count Update and Data After Installation of Speed Humps
6. Special Use Permit: Family YMCA of Tarrytown at EF Lugari School Building

Executive Session

- A. Stipulation Agreement – Recall Time
- B. Village Policy for Impounds
- C. Police Reform
- D. Personnel Matters



Tarrytown Fire Department

Chief: **BRYAN MEADE**
First Assistant: **KELLY MURPHY**
Second Assistant: **RICK TUCCI**

www.tarrytownfd.org

Secretary
KELLY MURPHY
Treasurer
DOMENIC MORABITO

September 15, 2020

Richard Slingerland
Village of Tarrytown-Village Administrator
1 Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, NY 10591

Mr. Slingerland,

At our monthly warden's meeting, the board of fire wardens discussed the executive order 202 in relation to Senate Bill 8251B. The original version of the bill was edited and amended in the Senate. It was then shortened to focus solely on the awarding of points to volunteers during the period when, for COVID 19 related reasons, volunteer firefighter and volunteer ambulance worker activities were cancelled and/or when restrictions/quarantines were in place on which some volunteers could not respond to calls. Senate Bill 8251B is attached.

As LOSAP Coordinator, I reached out to Ed Holohan, at Penflex who is our representative in regards to whether the points award has to apply for everyone or just those affected. He confirmed that it applies to everyone. The Board of Fire Wardens respectfully requests the Board of Trustees to write a resolution adopting this change, which will allow members to receive 5 points each month the executive order is in place. Also attached is an addendum to our point system description with the addition of the COVID section.

Firematically,

Kelly Murphy
Kelly Murphy

Department Secretary
LOSAP Coordinator

STATE OF NEW YORK

8251--B

IN SENATE

April 27, 2020

Introduced by Sens. KAMINSKY, BROOKS, GAUGHRAN, MARTINEZ -- read twice and ordered printed, and when printed to be committed to the Committee on Local Government -- committee discharged, bill amended, ordered reprinted as amended and recommitted to said committee -- committee discharged, bill amended, ordered reprinted as amended and recommitted to said committee

AN ACT to amend the general municipal law, in relation to the determination of points for service award programs for volunteer firefighters and volunteer ambulance workers during a state disaster emergency; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

1 Section 1. Section 217 of the general municipal law is amended by
2 adding a new subdivision (p) to read as follows:

3 (p) For purposes of determining total points earned for a calendar
4 year in which a state disaster emergency, as defined in section twenty
5 of the executive law, has been declared pursuant to executive order
6 number two hundred two of two thousand twenty, as amended, to address
7 the outbreak of novel coronavirus, COVID-19, an active volunteer fire-
8 fighter service award program may provide for the crediting of up to
9 five additional points per month, prorated for periods of less than one
10 month, to each active volunteer firefighter for each month that special
11 emergency response rules were in place restricting firefighter responses
12 to emergency responses and/or restricting the holding of activities for
13 which points could be earned due to guidelines related to the state
14 disaster emergency. A political subdivision electing to provide the
15 additional points authorized under this subdivision shall adopt a resol-
16 ution by April thirtieth, two thousand twenty-one determining the number
17 of additional points to be credited per month, provided that any addi-
18 tional points credited pursuant to this subdivision shall be in addition
19 to any other points earned pursuant to this section during the state
20 disaster emergency.

21 § 2. Subdivision 3 of section 219-e of the general municipal law is
22 amended by adding a new paragraph (k) to read as follows:

EXPLANATION--Matter in italics (underscored) is new; matter in brackets
[-] is old law to be omitted.

LBD16211-07-0



Village of Tarrytown Volunteer Firefighter Service Award Program Point System

Type of Activity	Maximum Annual Points for This Activity	How Points Are Credited	Comments
Completion of Training Courses	25	<p>Based on duration of training courses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Under 20 Hours = 1 Point per hour. Maximum of 5 points per course. 20 – 45 hours = 5 Points plus 1 point per hour over 20 hours. Maximum of 10 points per course. Over 45 hours = 15 points. 	<p>Training courses should be satisfactorily completed (certificate of completion required) and designated as approved course by the Service Award Committee. A list of approved courses will be posted and updated periodically.</p> <p>NOTE: Persons who are paid to attend training courses as part of their job or profession- get no credit in the Service Award Program for attending such courses.</p>
Attendance at Drills	20	1 Point per drill. (Minimum 2 hours duration)	Extra long drills of 4 or 6 hours are sometimes treated as two or more separate drills of at least 2 hours each.
Participating in Sleep-In or Stand-by session.	20	<p>➤ Sleep-in Session = 1 Point for each full night. (Shift of at least 8 hrs) Day or Night.</p> <p>➤ Stand-by Session = 1 Point for each session (4 hour minimum duration). Stand-by is defined as "a line of duty activity of the volunteer fire company, lasting four hours, not falling under one of the other categories.</p>	
Attendance at Official Fire Department Meetings. (Regular and Special Department-Wide Meetings called by the President or Chief.)	20	1 Point earned per meeting.	<p>Note: Must be a meeting all firefighters are expected to attend. (i.e., does not include committee meetings which are miscellaneous category, and also does not include officer/warden meetings, etc. which can be in the miscellaneous category.</p>



Village of Tarrytown Volunteer Firefighter Service Award Program Point System

Type Of Activity	Maximum Annual Points for This Activity	How Points are Credited	Comments
Holding a Specified Elected or Appointed Position	25	Points are earned for the completion of a one year term as a "line officer, a department officer, and president, vice president, treasurer and secretary of a fire company or department" as follows:	<p>NOTE: Points are awarded annually to one person for no more than one office, or points will be awarded up to a maximum of 25 (Twenty five) points annually for a person who simultaneously completes a one year term in more than one office.</p> <p>NOTE: An officer will be required to have fulfilled his duties of the office before points are granted.</p>
		TITLE	
		President	
		Vice President	
		Captain	
		Chief	
		Assistant Chiefs	
		Deputy Chiefs	
		Treasurer	
		Secretary	
		Recording Secretary	
		Financial Secretary	
		Computer Operator	
		Radio Dispatcher	
		Wardens	
		Lieutenants	
		Chief Driver	
		Assistant Chief Driver	
		Trustee	
		Directors	
		Arson Investigator	
		Safety Officer	
		Training Officer	
		Chaplain	
		Public Affairs Officer	
		Chauffer for Apparatus	



Village of Tarrytown Volunteer Firefighter Service Award Program Point System

the protection of life and property from fire or other emergency, accident or calamity in connection with which the services of such fire company or fire department are required.

How he or she accumulates the points will be through participating in the previously listed activities. Each activity awards different points. If a firefighter who for whatever reason (such as regular work hours) cannot earn as many points under one or more categories as other firefighters, he or she should focus on the total number of points he or she could earn from all categories of allowable point accumulation activities.

RETAINER AGREEMENT

The Village of Tarrytown (the "Village") hereby retains the law offices of Silverberg Zalantis LLC ("SZLLC") to act as Village Attorney in accordance with the following terms:

Personnel: Katherine Zalantis shall be primarily responsible for providing general legal services and acting as counsel to the Board of Trustees. Katherine Zalantis shall act as Planning Board counsel. Christie Tomm Addona shall serve as counsel to the Zoning Board of Appeals ("ZBA"). Steven Silverberg shall assist with matters when needed. The firm's attorneys and other staff shall be available to cover for each other and to assist with litigation and other matters.

Fee: SZLLC shall receive an annual fee as follows: \$60,713.52, payable in equal monthly installments of \$5,059.46 for general services as Village Attorney as described below; including services to the ZBA, which shall be invoiced to the Village on the first of the month following the performance of such services (collectively, "Fixed Fee Services").

In addition to the Fixed Fee Services set forth above, the Village shall continue with the procedure for charging applicants for legal fees for applications before the Planning Board, which applicants shall make payment into an escrow account from which SZLLC shall be paid its hourly rates for work performed on individual Planning Board applications. Likewise, other work not part of the Fixed Fee Services shall be charged at hourly rates. SZLLC shall not be an employee of the Village, but shall be an independent contractor and shall receive no benefits.

Scope of Flat Fee Services: The scope of services covered by the Flat Fee Services shall include: (1) attending all meetings of the Village Board and ZBA; (2) attending other meetings (e.g. with Mayor, administrator, staff and with other boards and commissions) on an as-needed basis; (3) providing counsel to the Village clerk, engineer, building inspector, etc.; (4) drafting legislation, resolutions and notices when requested; (5) drafting and reviewing all business documents, such as easements, contracts and leases; and (6) providing written opinions and memoranda as requested by the Village Board, ZBA and Planning Board.

The Flat Fee Services shall also include all e-mail correspondence and telephone calls between SZLLC and Village Officials and Village Staff in the normal course of business, except in the event that the communication is directly related to a litigation matter or a specific Planning Board application. The Village will provide clerical assistance for distributing or publishing notices, resolutions and internal correspondence and the collection and forwarding of mail and messages to SZLLC related to Village matters sent directly to the Village.

Non-Flat Fee Services: The Scope of Flat Fee Services shall not include: (1) any litigation, including Article 78 proceedings, tax certiorari, administrative proceedings before outside agencies and other litigation, as well as, appeals and any other litigation matter which SZLLC is assigned by the Village Board; (2) matters before the Planning Board; and (3) drafting/preparing a comprehensive plan and/or complete update of land use regulations. Such work not included in the Scope of Flat Fee Services shall be billed at the hourly rate of \$280.00 per hour for partners and counsel to SZLLC, \$180.00 to \$225 per hour for associates, \$125.00

3
per hour for law school graduates not yet admitted and \$75 per hour for paralegals. SZLLC shall separately invoice any charges which are subject to billing by the Village to applicants pursuant to local law to be adopted to provide for such procedure.

It is acknowledged that the Village shall retain, as needed, separate Bond Counsel and Village Prosecutor. In the event assistance from SZLLC is required for Village prosecutions, the time shall be billed at the rates set forth above.

In addition, the Village will be responsible to SZLLC for any disbursements and expenses that may be incurred by them in connection with services performed. Such disbursements and expenses may be included on a regular invoice or submitted separately. Such disbursements and expenses may include, (to the extent they are not provided or paid directly by the Village), but not necessarily be limited to filing fees, expert fees, photocopying charges (only for copying exceeding 100-pages), messenger charges, over-night delivery service, postage (certified/registered mail or large mailings for notices and the like) and similar expenses. In certain instances, invoices for such services shall be forwarded for direct payment to the service provider in order to save the Village sales tax charges.

Term: The Term of this agreement shall terminate on the date of the 2020 organizational meeting, however, either the Village Board or SZLLC may terminate this agreement, without cause, upon one hundred twenty (120) days written notice to the other.

Other Clients: During the term of this agreement SZLLC shall not represent any other client before any department, board or commission of the Village.

Dated as of January 1, 2021

Silverberg Zalantis LLC

By: _____
Katherine Zalantis, Member

Village of Tarrytown

By: _____
Richard Slingerland, Village Administrator

discuss the impact on the school district which could be as much as 48 children (24 two bedroom units, with one or two children per bedroom). The Rutgers Study average is something like 9 to 12 students which would be a breakeven point for the school system, not to make a profit or a surplus. With the pandemic, people are leaving the city and 24 to 48 students would have a tremendous negative impact on the fiscal condition of the Tarrytown school. The Rutgers study is a generic study and it warned against applying the data for smaller villages, but we blindly said, our consultant 9 to 12, their consultant said 9 to 12. We are better than that. I beg you, we're better than that. I think you should really consider what we need to do in the best interest of the village. We should not rush to judgment of this. I know people are going to say it has already been one or two years, but many projects that are successful took longer than this. You have to come to grips with your conscience and say, are you going to give into 88 units because you don't want storage or are you going to do something better for Tarrytown? And that's what I think you should do, something better for Tarrytown. I really think you should reconsider. And at least think about a positive declaration and go through these issues more carefully, more thoroughly. For the first time in 48 years, other than the Cooney Plant, have we had so many articulated concerns and valuable insights from citizens of our community. In all these years he can't remember so many good issues, not that they're right, but that they were raised, and that we did not respond to them by saying, okay, now we heard you and we will neg dec it. He asked the Board not to neg dec this application.

Dr. Friedlander made a motion to make a Positive Declaration and not a Negative Declaration on this application in order to study this further and hear more concerns from the public, and get a more thorough examination of the issues, the facts and the impacts of this development on this zone change, seconded by Mr. Birgy.

Dr. Friedlander asked for a roll call vote:

Member Raiselis:	No
Member Aukland:	No
Member Tedesco:	No
Chair Friedlander:	Yes
Member Birgy:	Yes

The vote to declare a Positive Declaration on this action failed by a majority of the Board. Motion denied. 3-2

Mr. Tedesco read through portions of this Negative declaration below and noted that a copy will be provided to the applicant and the entire Negative Declaration will be recorded in the minutes of this meeting which is attached as "Exhibit D".

Mr. Tedesco read that the proposed action consists of the development of a mixed use building containing 2,000 square feet of retail and 20,757 square feet of self-storage on the ground floor, with 88 residential units on four floors above a 1.18 acre property located at 29 South Depot Plaza, lot 38, with direct access to the train platform, development of landscape pedestrian plaza adjacent to the proposed mixed use

building at the foot of the stairs to the train platform. Approvals and rehabilitation of adjacent parking areas, including approving and landscaping the MTA employee parking lot, adjacent to Franklin courts, and approving and providing landscaping and LED dark sky compliant lighting to the MTA computer parking lots and development of pedestrian sidewalks, linking Franklin Courts to the train station, train platform and to the villages waterfront and park. In connection with the proposed development the applicant seeks zoning text amendments to the industrial or ID zone that would allow transit oriented development to date as a permitted use in the ID zone, for properties larger than one acre and located within 100 feet from direct access to the Metro North train station, as well as a site plan approval for proposed TOD development within the ID district. The applicant is proposing to use the foundation of the existing one story metal warehouse building to construct the proposed mixed use building. The subject property also abuts Metro North line right of way, as well as the Tarrytown train station with access stairs to the train platform. There have been modifications to the proposed zoning amendments. The planning board has reviewed the proposed zoning over several months, which has resulted in many modifications to the applicants originally submitted zoning and text amendments. These many revisions are contained in this Negative Declaration. Upon review of information recorded in the EAF plus the additional support information, which is contained in this Negative Declaration and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the village of Tarrytown Planning Board as lead agency, that the project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment. And therefore an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

Mr. Tedesco therefore moved, that the Planning Board issue a Negative Declaration on this action. Dr. Friedlander asked for Board comment. No one commented.

Dr. Friedlander asked for a roll call vote:

Member Raiselis: Yes
Member Aukland: Yes
Member Tedesco: Yes
Member Birgy: No
Chair Friedlander: No

The vote to declare a Negative Declaration on this project was approved by a majority of the Board. 3 - 2 Motion carried.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Aukland, that the Planning Board authorize the village staff to provide a letter to the Board of Trustees recommending the adoption of the Zoning Text Amendment, which will add provisions for a Transit Oriented Development in the ID Zoning District.

Dr. Friedlander asked if the Board had any comment. Mr. Birgy said when they submit the minority report to the Board, he will make it very clear that this is not a TOD, it is an excuse for a developer to build a hyper dense project, which gives them the ability to make additional profit at the expense of the village.

4

Dr. Friedlander asked for a roll call vote:

Member Raiselis: Yes
Member Aukland: Yes
Member Tedesco: Yes
Member Birgy: No
Chair Friedlander: No

Motion carried: 3-2 to recommend a report be sent to the Board of Trustees recommending the adoption of the Zoning Text Amendment.

Dr. Friedlander commented on the reasons he is voting NO against this project. He is opposed to the height of 60 feet and five stories. He is opposed to the fact that, in a residential zone, we have such limited, almost negligible setbacks. He is opposed to the fact that there is no separation of significance between an industrial usage like a recycling company, and a residential building. He is opposed to the fact that they are allowing 75% of coverage for a residential building, when in all other residential zones, it's considerably less, and would not be approved, if it was applied in residential densities. The density of 88 units is extreme. The coverage of the land is 75 units per acre. They have technically 1.18 acre of land, but 13,000 s.f. of this is a roadway used by industrial trucks, recycling trucks, and is dangerous for people living in a residential area. The land left without the roadway is less is 38,000 s.f. and they are proposing a building that's maxed out at 22,000 s.f. The separation between the industrial building the other building is no more than 10 feet at the present time. There are no side yards right next to the train station where children will be living with no protective distancing. No side yards on a rail or a major thoroughfare with 18 wheeler trucks going in and out. There are no considerable setbacks for safety at all. There is no landscaping of any sort. No project in Tarrytown has been approved in an area of a residential building that didn't have significant landscaping. This is incredible. The Planning Board spent six months talking about a trail and garbage storage and setbacks for the Temple Beth Application for a small addition and here we are rushing to approve a project without any setbacks for protecting the people that are going to live there. That is not good planning at all. How can we vote for things that we have been so opposed to for over 48 years. He doesn't understand it. We should have concerns about the rail, the roadway, and the safety of that roadway. We don't have any of that. We don't even have a systematic way of saying that this is the requirement of the zone to allow connectivity from the Franklin Court to the train station. And if that was so important, why didn't we do it without any developer. We could have done that just by breaking down that ugly fence and making a sidewalk and getting the MTA to give us an easement at that property. We don't need a development to get connectivity. We need the will and the foresight and the planning to do it. And we didn't do that. So I'm against sending this to the Village Board the way it is. This is not a Planning Board's proposal, this is an applicant's proposal to max out the development and the profit on this property and holding the village hostage to the two stories of self-storage is wrong and we shouldn't do it. So he is opposed and is voting no.

Project: S. Depot Plaza TOD

Date: November 23, 2020

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 3 - Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts
and
Determination of Significance

FILED 11/25/2020
 VILLAGE CLERKS OFFICE

Part 3 provides the reasons in support of the determination of significance. The lead agency must complete Part 3 for every question in Part 2 where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

Based on the analysis in Part 3, the lead agency must decide whether to require an environmental impact statement to further assess the proposed action or whether available information is sufficient for the lead agency to conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. By completing the certification on the next page, the lead agency can complete its determination of significance.

Reasons Supporting This Determination:

To complete this section:

- Identify the impact based on the Part 2 responses and describe its magnitude. Magnitude considers factors such as severity, size or extent of an impact.
- Assess the importance of the impact. Importance relates to the geographic scope, duration, probability of the impact occurring, number of people affected by the impact and any additional environmental consequences if the impact were to occur.
- The assessment should take into consideration any design element or project changes.
- Repeat this process for each Part 2 question where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.
- Provide the reason(s) why the impact may, or will not, result in a significant adverse environmental impact
- For Conditional Negative Declarations identify the specific condition(s) imposed that will modify the proposed action so that no significant adverse environmental impacts will result.
- Attach additional sheets, as needed.

Description of the Action

The proposed action consists of the: (i) development of a mixed-use building containing 2,000 square feet of retail and 20,757 square feet of self-storage on the ground floor with 88 residential units on four floors above on a 1.18 acre property located at 29 South Depot Plaza (Lot 38) with direct access to the train platform; (ii) development of landscaped pedestrian plaza adjacent to the proposed mixed-use building at the foot of the stairs to the train platform; (iii) Improvements and rehabilitation of adjacent parking areas, including improving and landscaping the MTA Employee Parking lot adjacent to Franklin Courts and improving and provide landscaping and LED dark-sky compliant lighting to the MTA commuter parking lots; and (iv) development of pedestrian sidewalks linking Franklin Courts to the train station, train platform and to the Village's waterfront and park.

In connection with the proposed development, the applicant seeks zoning text amendments to the Industrial District (ID) that would allow Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) as a permitted use in the ID zone for properties larger than one acre and located within 100 feet from direct access to the Tarrytown Metro North Train Station as well as a site plan approval for a proposed TOD development within the ID District. The applicant is proposing to use the foundation for the existing one-story metal warehouse building to construct the proposed mixed-use building. The subject property also abuts the Metro-North Hudson Line right of way as well as the Tarrytown Train Station, with access stairs for the train platform.

Modifications to Proposed Zoning Amendments - The Planning Board has reviewed the proposed zoning over several months which has resulted in the modifications to the Applicant's originally submitted zoning text amendments. The following revisions included: 1) First Floor Space - Minimum of 50% of first floor spaces shall be for non-residential uses (this allows for flexibility for live work units while still maintaining an active streetscape for pedestrians and pedestrian-oriented activities and businesses); 2) Proposed parking requirements (ratio of 1.05 spaces per residential unit, which exceeds the parking ratio recommended by the Chazen study for TOD of 0.95 spaces per unit); 3) Parking Agreement satisfactory to Village Attorney; required parking may be on-site or adjacent property subject to the parking agreement (this provides protection for the Village by ensuring Village legal review of any proposed agreement ensuring that parking will be available for project residents on an appropriate long term basis with protection against termination provisions); 4) Parking Space Width - Planning Board may reduce the width of parking space to 8 1/2' (this is the criteria used by MTA for their parking lots and exists in many Westchester communities especially for non-transient uses); 5) Non-Residential Parking - Parking requirement for non-residential uses may be provided through shared parking as approved by the Planning Board (this provision refers to an existing section of the code for shared parking (Section 305-83 (D) (3)); 6) Applicant must show that new sewer and water and traffic impacts can be mitigated to not negatively impact the existing network; 7) Efforts shall be made to incorporate Green infrastructure to reduce impacts (Applicant has provided a list of proposed green sustainable elements as part of their site plan); 8) Pedestrian Circulation and Connectivity - Applicant must show pedestrian circulation plan showing safe pedestrian access within the property and community connectivity. (Applicant has provided conceptual landscaping & pedestrian connectivity plan); 9) FEMA Regulations - Project shall comply with all applicable FEMA regulations. (this specifically calls out need to comply with FEMA requirements which is required by Building Department review).

(See attached for continuation of Long Form Environmental Assessment Part 3)

Determination of Significance - Type 1 and Unlisted Actions

SEQR Status: ☐ Type 1 ☒ Unlisted

Identify portions of EAF completed for this Project: ☒ Part 1 ☒ Part 2 ☒ Part 3

4
Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF, as noted, plus this additional support information

West. Co. Planning GML 8/2/19; PDA Socio-Economic & Fiscal Eval. 3/6/20; PDA Updated Fiscal 6/17/20, 7/14/20; Chazen Limited Tech. Report 6/11/20; Chazen Tech. Review #2, 7/8/20; PDA Viewshed Eval, 8/7/20; Parking Exhibit (PE-1), 8/19/20; JMC, Proposed Utility Serv, 3/6/20; PDA, TOD Parking Supplement, 3/6/20; JMC, Trip Generation, 8/10/20; L. Whitehead, Letters w/Supplemental Info, 8/18/20, 7/10/20, 8/18/20; Collins, Project Costs, 8/11/20

and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the
Village of Tarrytown Planning Board as lead agency that:

☒ A. This project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment, and, therefore, an environmental impact statement need not be prepared. Accordingly, this negative declaration is issued.

☐ B. Although this project could have a significant adverse impact on the environment, that impact will be avoided or substantially mitigated because of the following conditions which will be required by the lead agency:

There will, therefore, be no significant adverse impacts from the project as conditioned, and, therefore, this conditioned negative declaration is issued. A conditioned negative declaration may be used only for UNLISTED actions (see 6 NYCRR 617.7(d)).

☐ C. This Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement must be prepared to further assess the impact(s) and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce those impacts. Accordingly, this positive declaration is issued.

Name of Action: **South Depot Plaza TOD**

Name of Lead Agency: **Village of Tarrytown Planning Board**

Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency: **Dr. Stanley Friedlander**

Title of Responsible Officer: **Chairman**

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency: *Stanley L. Friedlander* Date: **11/23/20**

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer) **Robert Galvin, AICP Consulting Village Planner** Date: **11/23/20**

For Further Information:

Contact Person: **Lizabath Meszaros, Secretary to the Planning Board**

Address: **One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, NY 10591**

Telephone Number: **(914) 631-1487**

E-mail: **lmeszaros@tarrytownny.com**

For Type 1 Actions and Conditioned Negative Declarations, a copy of this Notice is sent to:

Chief Executive Officer of the political subdivision in which the action will be principally located (e.g., Town / City / Village of)

Other involved agencies (if any)

Applicant (if any)

Environmental Notice Bulletin: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/enb/enb.html>

4

Long Form Environmental Assessment
Part 3 – Continued

29 South Depot TOD Project

Modifications to Proposed Zoning Amendments (continued)

9) **Design Criteria** – no façade shall exceed 150' in length without architectural features designed to break up the visual effect of the building and avoid a box like appearance. Design features may include variations in height and with offsets, projections, balconies, setbacks, and other distinctive architectural elements. These design features need to be acceptable to the Planning Board. (Design Criteria have been added to the proposed zoning text to address massing concerns.)

10) **Sustainability Standards** – Project needs to comply with sound sustainability standards. Listing of examples are included in the text. (Applicant has provided a listing of potential sustainability measures which would be developed during the Planning Board's site plan review.)

11) **Maximum height of 60 and 5 stories** – Project needs to comply (and the proposed preliminary site plan complies) with the five-story maximum and the 60-foot maximum height for all protrusions, including rooftop parapets with no bulkheads for elevators or any rooftop amenity. Limiting protrusions is more protective of the viewshed.

Building Coverage/Setbacks – The underlying ID zone provides the standards for the building coverage and setbacks for the front yard and side yards. The proposed zoning overlay text provides for a zero rear yard setback if abutting the railroad tracks. **Building Coverage** in the underlying ID zone is 75%. The Village Engineer has reviewed this and determined that the project as constituted would have a building coverage of 47%. Even if the entire portion of South Depot Plaza were exempted from this calculation, the resulting building coverage would be 60% - still below the maximum coverage of 75%. **Side Yard Setbacks** in the underlying zone are 10' for each side yard. The Project's side yard on the north side of the building is 48' with the landscaped plaza. Project's side yard on the south side meets the 10' setback.

Front Yard Setback in the underlying zone is 10'.

Applicability: As proposed, the zoning amendment would limit TOD use to the subject property since this property is the only ID zoned parcel that would meet the criteria of eligibility regarding the minimum size of one acre with direct access to the train platform within 100' linear feet.

Consistency with the Village Comprehensive Plan

Tarrytown Connected is the Village's Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2018. With regard to the Station Area, the Plan states that the area, "represents a significant opportunity to leverage sustainable land use policies and expand transit-oriented development east of the railroad tracks. New spaces for working and living must be integrated with improved strategies for commuter parking that alleviate congestion around Depot Plaza." Based on the foregoing, the Plan supports the future development of transit-oriented development or mixed-used developments featuring increased residential density within the Station Area. Development of this type is described as a development type that will support sustainable

growth. It is noted that the development includes market rate apartment units, affordable housing units (as is required), 2,000 sf of retail and 20,000 sf of self-storage use. Transit-oriented development places a critical mass of new residents in close proximity to existing and future commercial uses thereby promoting pedestrian activity.

Tarrytown Connected included a 2009 residential density graphic that showed that the area immediately surrounding the proposed development site has a residential density of 5 - 15 units per acre in the area located immediately east (Franklin Courts). However, the parcel located to the northeast is developed with a residential density of greater than 75 units per acre (Franklin Tower). The proposed project would fall within this category with 75 units per acre or 88 units for the 1.18-acre parcel. Although not directly adjacent to the project site, the newer development within the waterfront, west of the railroad and north of Pierson Park, is developed with a residential density that ranges from 15 - 75 units per acre. Therefore, while the proposed project falls at the high end of the residential densities present within the Village it does not surpass the range and would present a project of the exact type desired in the Comprehensive Plan.

The Applicant's proposed zoning amendment would permit mixed-use residential buildings where they are not currently permitted. The Plan does not contain recommendations explicit to residential density, but the Plan's objectives were meant to, in part, "maximize the potential for the station area as a destination and a gateway to the greater Village." The proposed project, and in consideration of the proposed residential density, would be consistent with this Plan. (Chazen, *Limited Technical Review*, June 11, 2020, 13 - 15)

Subject Property – Site Plan

The subject property is a 1.18-acre flag lot located at 29 South Depot Plaza with access via a driveway that passes between a municipal parking lot and a vacant parcel owned by the Applicant, both located north of the site. South of the site is a paper recycling building which the warehouse building was previously associated with. This building would continue to be accessed by the subject parcel's driveway. The Applicant is proposing to use the foundation for the existing one-story metal warehouse building and build a mixed-use building containing 2,000 square feet of retail and 20,757 square feet of self-storage on the ground floor with 88 residential units on four floors above. The applicant has site plan approval for the conversion of the existing building into self-storage, but Applicant has revised the plans to include a retail and housing component to the project consistent with the goals of the Tarrytown Comprehensive Plan (*Tarrytown Connected*). The Project's unit mix is proposed to consist of 12 studios, 48 1-bedrooms and 28 2-bedroom units. The Project will include nine (9) affordable units consistent with Section 305-130 (*Affordable Housing*) with rents affordable for households whose incomes do not exceed 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

The Project will provide improvements and landscaping to the MTA Employee Parking lot adjacent to Franklin Courts and provide landscaping and LED dark-sky compliant lighting to the MTA commuter parking lots. The development will also provide pedestrian sidewalks linking Franklin Courts to the train station, train platform and to the Village's waterfront and park. A new 3,800 sf landscaped pedestrian plaza will be developed adjacent to the residential building and at the foot of the stairs to the train platform.

GML Review - The project was referred to Westchester County Planning on 7/23/19. County Planning provided a GML review dated 8/2/19 which found the project to be consistent with the County's *Comprehensive Plan* because it would direct new residential development where public transportation can be provided efficiently, and where redevelopment can enhance economic vitality. Applicant has responded to County Planning's recommendation by providing a pedestrian circulation plan around the building and complete sidewalk connectivity between the site and the surrounding neighborhoods. Applicant has provided specifics of green building and other sustainable technologies. The Applicant has provided for recycling and bicycle parking.

Evaluation of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

MTA Parking Agreement - The MTA has agreed to provide the Applicant with a 49-year lease for the use of the parking lot with two 15-year options, for a total lease period of 79 years. The termination provision previously discussed has been eliminated. This term will be acceptable for financing purposes and should be acceptable for the Village. Previously, the proposed text was amended to read *"required parking can be provided on-site or on an adjacent property or alternative property within 1000 feet, provided that the applicant has a long-term agreement for parking satisfactory to the Village Attorney."* This wording of "alternative parking within 1000 feet" is no longer needed and was deleted in the revised text. In order to obtain site plan approval, Applicant will have to be able to provide the written lease and the Village Attorney will need to be satisfied that the parking will be available for use by the tenants on a long-term basis. While other terms of the agreement with the MTA are still being finalized, the number of spaces and the term have been agreed to.

Parking Impacts - Parking for the development would be provided by 93 parking spaces designated for use by the residential tenants. There would be 14 on-site parking spaces with an additional 79 spaces provided in the adjacent MTA parking lots for the exclusive use of the project's residents. The 79 spaces are MTA spaces under Agreement for the Project's exclusive use. This results in a parking ratio of 1.05 spaces for the project. There are also two loading/parking spaces on the south side of the building for use by the self-storage facility. There are another 30 shared parking spaces in the MTA employee lot reserved for MTA employees between 5:00 am and 4:00 pm. These spaces are available for project residents in the remaining evening hours between 4:00 pm to 5:00 am and all time on the weekend. The Applicant also owns the adjacent Lot 37 which is 4,000 sf and has the potential of providing another 15 surface parking spaces if needed. The Parking Exhibit plan, dated, June 18, 2020 shows the configuration of the MTA commuter and employee parking lots and the number of spaces allocated to the project. Applicant proposes to reconfigure ingress/egress in the turnaround easement at the south end of South Depot Plaza for two-way traffic flow between the parking lot and South Depot Plaza.

The Chazen Report supported a parking ratio of 0.95 spaces for TOD residential units or 84 spaces. Applicant has increased its parking ratio to the 1.05 spaces per unit or 93 spaces exceeding the parking ratio in the Chazen Report. The consultant's shared parking analysis concluded that the Project's number of parking spaces available is more than the required parking spaces during peak parking demand.

Traffic Generation – the *JMC Trip Generation Analysis* shows that the transit-oriented development is projected to generate approximately 25 and 30 total vehicular trips during the peak weekday AM and PM hours. These projected vehicular trips represent one trip every 2.4 minutes during the peak weekday AM hour and one trip every 2.0 minutes during the peak weekday PM hour. The proposed TOD development's peak hour vehicular traffic represents 2-3% of the traffic volumes along Depot Plaza based on 2013 DOT traffic volume counts. The report concludes that the proposed TOD development is anticipated to generate a low amount of peak hour vehicular traffic due to the high level of transit utilization and will represent a very, small percentage of traffic which already exists on the area roadway network. Peak traffic in the station area is to the train station in the morning peak, and leaving the train station in the afternoon peak. Since residents will not be driving to the trains, there will be no addition to these peak movements. To the extent there is morning peak traffic, it will be away from the station area and in the afternoon peak, it will be to the area, the opposite of the peak traffic movements.

Green Technology – The proposed zoning code has added a provision indicating that the project shall comply with sound environmental sustainability standards. The Code provides guidance by including examples of such sustainable measures but does not limit the Applicant or the Board to these examples. The Code includes the following measures as examples for the Applicant including: 1) Use of solar panels for electric usage; 2) Use of geothermal sources to power heat pumps and air handlers; 3) Utilize *WaterSense* plumbing fixtures, drip irrigation and water submeters to reduce water usage; 4) Utilize energy star appliances, low VOC products, high efficiency filters, UV treatment for air handling units; 5) Utilize materials that have environmental product declaration as well as health product declaration and sound construction waste management; 6) project shall achieve an energy-efficient rating better than 15% of ASHRAE 90.1 standards.

Fiscal Analysis – The existing taxes for the subject property total \$65,704 annually. Of this total, the Village receives \$20, 446; the Tarrytown School District is provided with \$34,650 while the Town/County receive \$10,608. *The projected total yearly taxes* for the Project including the residential, retail, and self-storage is estimated to be \$562,090, an increase of \$496,386. The Village would realize \$134,902, an increase of \$114,456. The Tarrytown School District would receive \$354,117, an additional \$319, 467 in annual taxes while the Town/County receive additional annual taxes of \$68.085.

School Impacts - The TOD development is anticipated to result in a significant surplus to the Tarrytown School District. The Proposed Project is anticipated to provide a surplus to the School District ranging from \$96,839 to \$225,478, depending on the public-school age child generation rate used. It is anticipated that the contribution in taxes will be on the higher range because of the relatively few, if any, public school age children anticipated from the proposed project.

View Shed Analysis – *An Evaluation of Impact on Aesthetic Resources* was provided by Planning & Development Advisors (PDA) for the proposed project. This report reviewed impacts on the adjacent Franklin Courts community and upland properties. At the request of Village staff, Exhibit 5 in the report was prepared showing a relationship between the existing site and the surrounding topography. The yellow line on Exhibit 5 reflects elevation 65' which would be roughly equivalent to the top of a building that could be built under the proposed zoning (existing grade is 5', proposed building is 60' in height).

Staff also requested the view from MacArthur Lane. Evaluation indicated that there is extensive vegetation impeding the views looking west with no negative impacts on view sheds.

Environmental Constraints – Based on FEMA maps, the subject property is located in 0.2% annual chance Flood Hazard Area. The project will need to comply with FEMA flood hazard regulations. The site does not contain any wetlands nor any steep slopes or vegetation. The site also does not contain any reported spills in the NYSDEC Site Remediation Database. The Project is a redevelopment of an industrially zoned property.

Recreation Fees – The transit-oriented development will provide approximately \$900,000 in recreation fees to the Village Recreation Fund based on the 88 units proposed @ \$10,500 per unit.

SEORA Determination of Significance – Based on the Planning Board's review of the LEAF, an analysis of Part 2 and a review of Applicant's submitted information including parking and traffic studies, information on other TOD Projects in Westchester County, fiscal analysis, view sheds, school children generation, green technologies, and density analysis, the *Chazen Technical Reviews* of Applicant's submissions including parking/traffic and density analyses and Westchester County Planning's GML review, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed action including the proposed zoning text and site plan for the proposed TOD redevelopment of the 29 South Depot property is not expected to result in any significant adverse environmental impacts that would rise to the level of significance required for a Positive Declaration.

4

Village of Tarrytown Planning Board

Memo

To: Mayor Thomas D. Butler
Deputy Mayor Rebecca McGovern
Trustee Karen Brown
Trustee Robert Hoyt
Trustee David T. Kim
Trustee Douglas Zollo
Trustee Paul J. Rinaldi

From: Stanley L. Friedlander, Chairman of the Planning Board
Paul Birgy, Planning Board Member

Date: December 15, 2020

Re: Minority Report opposing the Recommendation for Proposed Zoning Text Amendments to Industrial Zone to allow Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) as a permitted use for the Property located at 29 South Depot Plaza

We respectfully submit a minority report with regard to your request for a proposed zone change allowing residential living in an industrial zone. The minority members are Paul Birgy and Stanley Friedlander. Sally Lawrence, the alternate on the Planning Board and the Chair of the Zoning Board, wishes to join us in support of the minority position. As the Chair of the Planning Board, this zone change has been the most difficult and contentious decision in my 48 years. To my recollection, the Board has never had a 3-2 split on any application or recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For this reason, we believe it is important for the Board of Trustees to consider our areas of disagreement and hopefully reach a consensus among yourselves as to what changes you deem wise and appropriate. We have listened carefully to our citizen's comments at the November 23, 2020 Planning Board Public Hearing, which are attached. We agreed with many of their views and we share their concerns. As far as we can discern, the public is adamantly opposed to the scale and density of the project.

The Planning Board approached this assignment incorrectly. The correct procedure would have been for the Planning Board to consider whether residential should be included in the industrial zone. If the response is affirmative, the corollary is what changes and restrictions in the ID zone would be necessary to protect the health, welfare and safety of the new residents. To change a long-standing zoning tradition, separating industrial and residential, requires a careful analysis. The last step in this process would be an analysis of the appropriate standards required to permit the mixing of the two zones. The Planning Board did not do this and it was a mistake. As a result,

we commingled the two issues and focused almost exclusively on a specific application to permit residential and storage on this one site. The developer wrote the changes in the zone that would permit this development to go forward.

All the members of the Planning Board support residential and mixed use in this industrial zone and more affordable housing in the village. At the same time, we recognize traffic congestion, parking, and taxes are critical problems that the village needs to consider when evaluating a zone change and new developments, especially when they require significant deviations from the existing code as in this application. This is particularly important when we are considering an unusual request to mix industrial and residential in the same zone, and possibly, as in this case, in the same building. Impacts of industrial use in a residential zone requires careful study of potential adverse impacts on the health and safety of new residents living in an industrial zone. Unfortunately, the Planning Board focused on the zone changes submitted by the developer for a particular project and site, and not on the full zoning implications.

First, we believe it is useful to respond to the public's request for the background regarding the proposed zone change and the application to build the 88-unit residential development above one floor of self-storage. About 4 years ago, the Planning Board was instrumental in initiating a Comprehensive Plan, which was followed by the Station Area zoning, and both major efforts were supported. Two of the Planning Board members, Ms. Raiselis and Mr. Aukland did excellent work in producing important and useful documents to guide the village's future. We all appreciate their work and effort. The importance of residential opportunities in the station area was a major interest for all of the Planning Board members and was wholeheartedly endorsed.

Before the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and the Station Area zoning, the applicant purchased property and applied for and received approval for a self-storage facility consisting of two floors with approximately 42,000 s. f. During this process, the Planning Board encouraged the applicant to substitute residential for storage, and if this was not possible, mixing both uses. After the approval for the self-storage was granted, and with the encouragement from the Board, the applicant attempted to integrate the two uses. A proposal of 46 residential units was submitted. Still not satisfied, the Planning Board encouraged the applicant to seek additional assistance to improve the design of the proposal. In August of 2019, the applicant requested an amendment to the zoning code to allow Transit Oriented Development as a permitted use in ID zoned properties with a proposal of 69 units above self-storage with a retail component. Subsequently, the applicant partnered with Collins Enterprises and increased the density to 88 units. When the 88 units was presented to the Planning Board, the applicant stated this density was the minimum feasible "profitable" development for this site. If this was not granted they would withdraw the application and self-storage would be built.

The Chair tried to determine the validity of this statement. Mr. Collins supplied proprietary confidential data to the Planning Board. The data was insufficient for the Chair to ascertain the accuracy of this statement. The majority of the Board did not wish to further pursue this inquiry. As a result, we do not know what level of density, given the acquisition costs of land,

would be profitable and at what rate of return on investment. We do know that the applicant believed that 42,000 s.f. of self-storage would be profitable. Building additional residential above storage would be adding significant economic value to the project. The public's position is whether there are substantial net benefits for the granting of increased density and additional uses in this zone.

When this application was before your Board, (the Board of Trustees), for a referral for the 88 units, you decided to control the impact of the development by restricting the height to 60 feet and five stories and you referred the application back to the Planning Board to study the project and make zoning change recommendations back to your Board. Your decision was consistent with setting a design standard to control density and quality of life for future residents. We tried to follow in your footsteps and change the applicant's proposal to better control density on this project and set a better benchmark for future developments in the inner village.

The applicant accepted your decision on the height and returned to the Planning Board. What would be the Board of Trustees decision if the applicant stated that they needed 70 or 80 feet or 6 to 8 floors and would withdraw the application if it was not granted? During the Planning Board review, the applicant refused to accept any zone standards recommended by the Planning Board. Under normal circumstances, the Board of Trustees would make a request to the Planning Board for a recommendation regarding a change in a zone and the Planning Board would proceed and develop appropriate standards for this altered zone. In this case, the zone change was prepared by the applicant for his goals and purposes and not necessarily in the village's interest. The majority of the Planning Board members decided to accept the zone changes of the applicant with only minor changes. The applicant refused to accept any major changes and, on numerous times, threatened to withdraw their application if it was not approved. The majority of the Planning Board decided to accept the applicant's proposed zoning text because they feared losing the opportunity to have residential development on this site and have the previously approved 42,000 s.f. two-story self-storage facility built. As a result, no serious effort to mitigate, reduce or modify the proposal was made despite multiple efforts on the part of the minority to compromise and find a more balanced, less dense zone change.

We reject the process of coercion and the, "take it or leave it approach", or the "my way or the highway", situation the Planning Board faced. A more cooperative and collaborative process would have achieved a more desirable and unanimous outcome among the members of the Board. We believe in "balanced growth" to improve the quality of life of our village residents. Growth, alone, is not our goal unless it provides significant public benefits for our village. The health, safety and welfare of our residents is our major concern keeping in mind our goals such as affordable housing, diversity of housing, lower taxes, better schools, cleaner environment, community access to public spaces and commercial businesses, and the reduction of traffic congestion, and balanced growth and development compatible with the size, capacity, history and architecture of our village.

Our negative votes are based on the following:

1 – Density

The proposed change in the zone allows residential and retail in an I.D. zone, effectively adopting a mixed-use zone. The proposal established a maximum density of 75 units per acre. This density is excessive and dangerous setting a standard of density in the village that will lead to congestion, traffic and adverse fiscal impacts.

In this particular proposal for 29 South Depot Plaza, the applicant applies the 75-unit per acre density. The property is 1.18 acres, which allows for another 13 units to be developed on site, hence, 88 units. In reality, the “buildable” land is slightly less than 9/10ths of an acre. A portion of the 51,000 s.f. lot, specifically 13,000 s. f. consists of a major roadway with easements for the MTA, County of Westchester, and the recycling company. This area should not be included in this calculation resulting in a 10% reduction which would bring the density down to 64 units, rather than the proposed 88 units. In addition, the project also proposes one floor of storage space in excess of 21,000 s.f.

The majority Planning Board recommendation states that in defense of the 75 unit per acre density that this density already exists in the Village. Please note the error on page 4 of the recommendation to your Board which cites that the density in Hudson Harbor ranges from 15 to 75 units per acre. This is inaccurate since there are 238 units of 23 plus acres, which calculates a density closer to 10 – 11 units per acre. It should also be noted that Edge on Hudson is 1180 units on 100 acres which calculates to a density of 12 units per acre.

Density levels approaching 200 people on one acre is excessive and may be detrimental to the health and safety of the residents. If we were to apply that density standard for Hudson Harbor, we would have 4,000 people on 23 acres or with Edge on Hudson, we would have 10,000 people on 50 acres. It should also be noted that the G.M. property was 100 acres but Sleepy Hollow received approximately 50 acres east of the tracks as a major public benefit, resulting in a density of 20 units per acre.

Recognizing the rationale and need for higher density in a TOD zone, we recommend an increase in density of no more than 3 times the level of Hudson Harbor. (36 units per acre). The Board of Trustees could consider permitting a maximum density bonus of 25%– 30% based upon an equivalent value of public benefit. (Bear in mind that 36 units per acre (as of right) may be excessive if it becomes the new benchmark in the inner village). We urge caution and calibration.

The Comprehensive Plan and TOD models do not specify a density for residential development. Even if they did, one size does not fit all. TOD density levels should be developed in a manner that fits the specific site and village context. Compatible density and balanced quality of life growth should dictate density in a TOD zone.

In addition, Franklin Towers/Courts and Asbury Terrace were built more than 60 years ago under Federal Government financing and regulations and they should not be used as models or

cf

guides for future development in this area. These buildings also exceed the 60-foot, 5-story height limit imposed by the Board of Trustees. If we reject the ten-story height, why should we use the 75-unit density of these buildings? We need to be consistent. We recognized the desirability of reasonable, balanced and community compatible density in a TOD zone. We would support a density of three times greater than the most recent TOD development (Hudson Harbor). A density of 36 units per acre is reasonable and consistent for a TOD in a small Village bounded by the Hudson River and with only one south-north corridor Route 9 Broadway and at the foot of the Mario Cuomo Bridge.

2 – Height

The Board of Trustees limited the maximum height of the zone to 60 feet and 5 stories. We support a height restriction but recommend a 4 -story building at 50 feet to mitigate the damage to the viewsheds of the Hudson River.

3 – Building Coverage

The ID Zone provides a building coverage of 75% of the land. While this is appropriate for an industrial zone, it should not be applied to a residential zone. It is in excess of every residential zone in the Village Code.

4 - Setbacks

Setbacks in zoning codes are the tools to protect the quality of life goals of our residents and businesses. The setbacks in the ID zone are inappropriate for a residential zone. These setbacks are designed to achieve a safer and better environment for residents such as: open space, light, landscaping, distance from traffic, and other less compatible uses surrounding the residential development.

The majority of the Planning Board accepted setbacks in the ID zone. We believe that this was a mistake. A reasonable standard of setbacks that currently exist in our residential zones should be applied in the mixed-use residential proposal.

The minority recommends:

- A 50-foot separation between an industrial building and a residential building.
- A 15-foot setback for each side yard for safe pedestrian flow, to allow for landscaping and for distance to roadways and railways.
- A 30-foot setback for the front and rear of the building.

5 – View and Viewsheds (Mass and Length of Building)

The subject of views is a sensitive and complex topic affecting the quality of life, especially in Rivertown communities. The unique views of the Hudson River and its banks, the new Mario Cuomo Bridge, the Tarrytown Lakes and historic buildings brings joy, happiness and beauty as well as economic value to all of our residents. To account for protecting views, we must consider such factors as: the viewers, site location, each direction of view, height, setbacks, land coverage, length of building and mass. Tradeoffs among these factors can mitigate and improve the views and viewsheds, for example, a taller building may allow wider viewsheds.

4
(Note that it took more than 2 years to determine the viewsheds at Hudson Harbor. As a result, we had 50 feet to 80 feet viewsheds between buildings).

The majority^{ds} the Planning Board recommended a 150-foot maximum length. The applicant rejected the standard. To accommodate the applicant, the majority changed the maximum to an unspecified length if the developer can break up the length of the building by acceptable design standards.

We recommend a maximum length of 150 feet with only a 25% increase in length with acceptable design standards NOT to unspecified and NOT 300 feet as presented in the plan. As the text is currently written, the building would be a 300-foot-long mass, 60 feet high and 70 feet deep which is completely unacceptable.

6 – Parking and Traffic

Parking Agreement: The parking agreement with the MTA and the applicant has not been presented to the Planning Board. The application and zone change should not move forward until an acceptable agreement has been consummated.

Parking Space Unit Requirement: The parking requirement for multi-family residential is 2.5 spaces per unit. To reduce it to approximately 1.0 per units is a major reduction that requires more analysis, especially in light of complaints from Hudson Harbor and in a post pandemic world. Suburban geography, the pandemic and the possibility of residential units have two or more adults, and one or more adult children living with parents, may result in more cars and parking spaces than 1.0 per unit in the inner village and TOD zone. An incremental and less radical adjustment in the ratio would be more prudent under these conditions of uncertainty. Perhaps you should consider a more modest reduction of 1.5 per unit (a variable ratio based on the number of bedrooms: 1.75 for 2 bedrooms and 1.25 for one bedroom, may be appropriate).

Traffic: The methodology of averaging and time of movements in the development underestimates the impact on traffic. We do not believe the traffic analysis considers the traffic impacts of the Edge on Hudson to the station area. The traffic to and from the station from Edge on Hudson was not adequately analyzed by the consultants. Residents live in peak load reality, i.e., getting to school, the train, and work in narrow time bands. Traffic studies that do not factor in these realities distort the impact on convenience and quality of life for our residents. This site is landlocked on three sides with a pinch point (bottleneck) across from the Village Hall. All traffic leaving the train station (drop-offs) must pass the entrance/exit of 29 South Depot Plaza. Just picture a large number of drop-offs from Edge on Hudson passing the pinch point between 8 a.m. and 8:10 a.m. This was not discussed by either traffic consultants. Traffic studies should include reality-based experiences such as construction, breakdowns, accidents, special events, and specific time requirements for travel to destinations. It should provide deviations and distortions rather than averages alone.

7 – Applicability

The new zone calls for limited applicability to properties 100 feet from the train stations. We are concerned that there was no explicit rationale and justification for this 100-foot metric. We believe that it is arbitrary and not consistent with the TOD standards of walkability to public transit. (Many of our current train station parking spaces are in excess of the arbitrary 100 feet). Thus, the Village may have future applicants demanding the same zoning conditions because they are in a TOD Zone and may ask for equivalent densities. This could result in possible expensive litigation if not granted or potential defeats in court allowing excessive density. TOD standards do not limit development to 100 feet from public transit. A reasonable standard would be a 10 to 15-minute walk or a distance of 3,000 to 5,000 feet. We cannot be inconsistent if we are using the concept of TOD to increase density to state that it is restricted to one property.

Any increase in density and change of use in the standards of the building code including coverage, height, setbacks, etc., results in increased value to the landowner. It seems improper to have a zone that permits only one landowner to benefit from these changes. It should be applied universally and should result in an equal playing field for all. Discriminating in favor on one at the expense of others, is unfair, unethical and not in the public's interest.

If we are unable to succeed in defending the new zone, we would be confronted with a zone without desirable standards for the residents. As a result, there are at least 8 to 10 properties that could be developed in a TOD zone. At the current density, that would generate as many as 800 units with 800 cars and 2,000 people. This would overload the schools, congest the streets, and cause serious gridlock and fiscal problems. This would be dangerous and would destroy the quality of life for our residents. We have not determined whether Tarrytown has the capacity and infrastructure to absorb significant population growth.

8 – Fiscal Impacts

The analysis and data evaluating the fiscal benefits was limited and inadequate. We believe the number of children proposed for this project (12), is underestimated. Twelve children at \$30,000 per child would be the break-even number of the school district based on the applicants estimated school revenue. With 24- two-bedroom units, it is possible that a minimum of 24 children, one per unit or as many as 48 children at 2 per unit may enrolled in our schools. This would cause significant adverse impacts on the school district's finances. At the very least we should solicit the views and concerns of the school district. (Dr. Howard Smith an education expert and former Superintendent of Schools of Tarrytown has communicated his concerns about future school enrollment and the possible negative effects of excessive density and development in the pandemic and post pandemic world. Dr. Smith's knowledge and expertise valuable and should not be ignored. (For example, he pointed out the need for an assessment of capital expenditures from increased enrollment; this was not included in the fiscal analysis. We only had data on operating expenses.)

This pandemic has produced urban flight, reflecting rising values of suburban homes and apartments. Families seeking non-dense environments with in school learning may seek these

new apartments, and working at home may facilitate the flight. Using outdated and generic data from the Rutgers University Housing and School Generation Study may not be useful or accurate for assessing the impact on a school district in a small village in Westchester County in a post pandemic world. The researchers warn the reader not to apply this data to individual sites. We are concerned about the possible adverse impacts on the school finances and the burden that will be placed on the taxpayer.

The increased revenues from this project is exaggerated. We should compare their estimates with the revenues generated by the approved self-storage development. For comparative purposes, a combined building with one floor of storage and less dense residential, for example, 46 units, would be useful to determine the benefit to the village.

The same argument holds for population growth that warrants more and expensive village services, especially large and expensive capital expenditures on major infrastructure projects. There was no "analysis of net benefit of taxes". We have been shown the revenues but not the costs. At that very least, we need to assess these potential impacts before recommending a major zone change.

9 - Public Benefits

A density of more than 36 units per acre can be justified if it can provide significant public benefits. This was achieved in Hudson Harbor by raising the height of the building. There was an increase in density in exchange for millions of dollars in public benefits such as: the Riverwalk Park, the construction of the DPW garage, a subsidy for the construction of the Village Hall, the construction of the Recreation center and pool, including the landscaping of the parks and moving the tennis and basketball courts, creating a water park and playground with landscaping along the Riverwalk, affordable housing at Wildey Street, and increased tax revenues. We believe these principles of trading density for public benefit is desirable if we can mitigate any of the negative effects of density and ensure the public benefits are significant to offset any mitigation costs. Another example of public benefit tradeoff is the recent YMCA re-development project proposed by Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. The density of this project is higher than desirable but it is offset by substantial public benefits, specifically, the preservation of an historic structure, the construction of a 69-parking space garage for village residents and visitors which will benefit the business merchants and add vibrancy to the RR district. Most important, it provides 109 units of affordable housing units and will allow the current residents at the YMCA to continue to live in our community pre and post construction.

The current proposal for 29 South Depot Plaza does not provide any significant public benefit that will improve the quality of life for village residents. Connectivity and pedestrian activity are stated as public benefits, but they have minimal impact to almost all of the village residents. With or without any development, if the village wants to improve connectivity for residents of Franklin Courts, we can work with the Housing Authority and the MTA to improve access and walkability between Franklin Courts and the train station and the waterfront park.

10 – Affordable Housing

The village's commitment to affordable housing and housing diversity is unequivocal and clear. This development does not exceed the village's requirement for affordable housing. The Planning Board strongly endorses this goal. The best method to increase affordable housing may not be achieved by adding high density development. The 10% village requirement may be insufficient. There are better options to increase affordable housing for example:

1. Increase the village requirement from 10% to 20%. (Talleyrand on Route 119, was required to set aside 20% for affordable housing).
2. Identify village sites and work with affordable housing developers (like Mr. Balter) and the Housing Committee to build affordable housing. (a public-private partnership)
3. Ensure the affordable housing requirements are implemented and enforced. (How do we know if the existing 60 units at Talleyrand are occupied by the qualifying tenants?)

11 – SEQRA Determination (Deficiencies and Unanswered questions)

Below are reasons and some unanswered questions which support why we voted against a Negative Declaration for the proposed zoning changes to an ID zone.

1. A more expansive study of the environmental impacts on the residents is needed.
2. More data is needed on the possible soil conditions and contamination on site as requested by TEAC.
3. More data and information are needed on the traffic conditions at the Station Area and Broadway intersections in neighboring areas and Main Street with particular attention to the Edge on Hudson Development, currently under construction, to determine impacts to the entire village.
4. Traffic studies and analysis of congestion at pinch points and bottlenecks is needed.
5. Traffic impact is needed to explore the quality of life effects such as the travel time between home and specific destinations such as the train station, school, church, sports events, etc. The impacts of the time lost due to the traffic and the wait at bottlenecks especially at Broadway and Main Street going to the train station.
6. A more thorough data analysis on viewshed and height is needed.
7. Additional data is needed on the operation of the recycling plant which is only 10 feet from the proposed site. Impacts with respect to garbage, noise, odor, toxic materials, traffic, trucks idling. Need a schedule of the amount of trucks that come through and how they affect safety in the area.
8. More data is needed relative to the parking ratio in the current post pandemic time. The existing ratio needs to be re-evaluated. The parking ratio is going from 2.5 to 1.05 under the assumption that the residents will not use as many cars.
9. A more thorough analysis of "net fiscal benefits" on the village and the school district is needed. The Planning Board never consulted with the school district or the Village Treasurer.
10. The Planning Board never discussed safety issues with the Police and Fire Departments with respect to fire safety on the west side of the structure and on parking and traffic access.
11. The Planning Board never analyzed the cumulative impacts of future developments, including 3 applications that are currently before the Planning Board.

- 4
12. Can all types of permitted industrial uses be integrated with residential uses in a single building?
 13. Are there limits to the proportion of the zone for mixed uses, i.e., industrial, residential and retail?
 14. What types of industrial uses should be prohibited in an integrated building because of health and environmental issues?
 15. What is the safest distance between uses?
 16. What are the parking needs for industrial uses compared to retail and residential?
 17. What parking standards should we apply for retail in the ID zone?
 18. Should we require separate buildings?
 19. What tradeoffs in height and building mass would improve views and viewsheds?
 20. What public benefits would warrant increased density and heights?
 21. What is the minimum level of density required to build housing in the station area and the inner village?

All of the above issues and questions would be carefully explored under a positive declaration. At the very least, we should consult with the school district and the village treasurer. Zone changes for residential density in and existing I.D. zone, is a major change in this village, which requires a much more detailed careful review and analysis.

12 – Future Planning

The Housing Committee reported that the population of the village has not increased over the past 50 years, hovering at approximately 11,000. At face value, it appears that we have reached a stable equilibrium compatible within limits of our existing infrastructure. The 10-year snapshots of population each decade is misleading, implying stagnation, and that no growth or change has occurred. A more dynamic analysis of population growth and decline is needed. The housing stock has grown significantly during this 50-year period. While the population has remained stable over the past fifty years, the housing stock has grown by approximately 1,200 units and this includes a diversity of housing styles and prices. Currently, our housing mix includes garden apartments, town houses, condos, apartment buildings, single family homes ranging from 5,000 square feet to 3 plus acres. Cyclical population growth may explain the existing housing stability. Population changes are non-linear and more cyclical. Population change is a complex phenomenon. Factors that determine growth include but are not limited to, fertility and mortality rates, immigration and emigration, economic growth, housing stock, family size, school districts, social services, cultural and recreational facilities, quality of the labor force, etc. We should be prudent and cautious in making major policy decisions based on static data on population growth. To conclude, if we added 800 units over the next 5 years and housing stock of the 1950-1970 period turned over, we would have a population growth of possibly 4,000 people (2,000 for new housing plus 2,000 for turnover). This increase of 4,000 to a base of 11,000 is not sustainable. The infrastructure capacity is inadequate to absorb this excess growth.

With respect to future traffic congestion and in order to support our retail merchants and future development, the village should consider establishing a comprehensive traffic study and a shuttle fund (including the possibility of autonomous self-driving vehicles). This can be

accomplished either by a grant or by issuing a low interest rate bond, and have developers pay off the bond, based on the size of the project.

Future planning must consider the impacts of this pandemic. Changes in housing, work, travel, recreation, commerce, all have to be evaluated, analyzed and comprehended. It will affect all of us and we have to be judicious, careful and incremental in our planning and decision making.

Some questions to consider are:

Will people take public transit?

Will people work at home?

Will children need in teaching environments?

Will cars and other transit replace conventional transit?

Will these changes be temporary or permanent?

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we believe the proposed changes to the industrial zone are not in the best interest of the Village. We do not believe an unbalanced and unfair trade-off of one floor of self-storage in exchange for 88 residential units is in the best interest of the village. In fact, our hard ball position is that a two-story self-storage facility, generating more taxes than the current taxes and with no adverse impact on the village, is better than a high-density development with major adverse impacts. In this case, less is more.

We recommend strict modifications of the zone that allows zoning standards appropriate for residential development and that will protect the health, safety and welfare of the new residents and the existing residents. We believe that the village needs to develop unified TOD standards. We strongly believe that this proposed project will have a critical precedent setting impact on the Village. We urge caution in addressing this issue. We hope you can reach a decision that will protect the village and allow balanced and compatible growth. Ideally, a compromise solution of some storage and modest density would be the best solution to this problem. We have failed to achieve this goal. Perhaps the BOT can succeed.

We stand ready to answer any of your questions and address any concerns you may have.

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to address the Board.



TARRYTOWN POLICE DEPARTMENT
DETECTIVE DIVISION
ONE DEPOT PLAZA ○ TARRYTOWN, NY 10591



Detectives (914) 631-1514
Main Desk (914) 631-5544
Fax (914) 631-5284

December 22, 2020

Chief Barbelet,

Attached are copies of the Miller Park traffic studies conducted by the Tarrytown Police Department from 2016 until present day. Additionally I have attached a summary page highlighting the dates, locations, volumes and 85th percentile results.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregory Budnar", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lt. Gregory Budnar

Traffic Study Results Summary

Street	Start Date	End Date	Total Volume	85th Percentile
Church Street	7/13/2018	7/20/2018	8,361	29 MPH
	11/10/2020	11/17/2020	4,940	27.9 MPH
Independence Street	1/18/2016	1/25/2016	11,063	30 MPH
	6/21/2019	6/28/2019	12,580	29 MPH
	9/18/2019	9/25/2019	10,516	28 MPH
	10/5/2020	10/12/2020	6,650	24.9 MPH
Park Avenue	11/10/2020	11/17/2020	4,387	22.9 MPH
Riverview Avenue	1/8/2016	1/12/2016	7,711	32 MPH
	6/21/2019	6/27/2019	15,095	29 MPH
	9/18/2019	9/23/2019	10,292	29 MPH
	10/5/2020	10/12/2020	8,683	18.9 MPH

5

Church Street

The attached traffic study was conducted on Church Street from July 13, 2018 through July 20, 2018. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Church Street was 8,361. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 29 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department
One Depot Plaza Tarrytown, NY 10591

Page 1

Site Code: 00000001
 Station ID:
 Church St
 Riverview Av
 Latitude: 0' 0.0000 South

Westbound															
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
7/13/2018	0	3	17	52	98	82	28	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	281
7/14/2018	0	19	27	76	127	81	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340
7/15/2018	0	2	29	45	107	87	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	290
7/16/2018	0	11	20	67	170	129	38	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	441
7/17/2018	0	9	53	93	158	82	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	413
7/18/2018	0	10	21	69	179	99	26	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	407
7/19/2018	0	14	18	77	128	83	32	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	356
7/20/2018	0	11	17	59	136	89	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	336
Westbound Total	0	79	202	538	1103	732	188	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	2864

85 percentile = 27

Eastbound															
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
7/13/2018	0	1	15	39	124	151	69	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	418
7/14/2018	0	2	49	86	142	169	68	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
7/15/2018	0	7	44	39	105	138	60	9	6	0	0	0	0	2	410
7/16/2018	0	1	37	80	182	253	110	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	689
7/17/2018	0	5	66	89	208	123	49	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	543
7/18/2018	0	1	37	99	300	260	92	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	800
7/19/2018	0	1	39	125	350	373	107	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	1018
7/20/2018	0	1	30	85	345	421	180	32	2	0	0	0	0	0	1096
Eastbound Total	0	19	317	642	1756	1888	735	119	18	0	0	1	0	2	5497

85 percentile = 30

Combined															
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
7/13/2018	0	4	32	91	222	233	97	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	699
7/14/2018	0	21	76	162	269	250	78	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	863
7/15/2018	0	9	73	84	212	225	77	11	6	0	0	0	0	3	700
7/16/2018	0	12	57	147	352	382	148	29	3	0	0	0	0	0	1130
7/17/2018	0	14	119	182	366	205	66	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	956
7/18/2018	0	11	58	168	479	359	118	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	1207
7/19/2018	0	15	57	202	478	456	139	25	2	0	0	0	0	0	1374
7/20/2018	0	12	47	144	481	510	200	36	2	0	0	0	0	0	1432
Combined Total	0	98	519	1180	2859	2620	923	140	18	0	0	1	0	3	8361

85 percentile = 29

5

Church Street

The attached traffic study was conducted on Church Street from November 10, 2020 through November 17, 2020. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Church Street was 4,940. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 27.9 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department
One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Site Code: 00000001

Station ID:

Location 1: Church Street

Location 2: Riverview Avenue

Location 3:

Location 4:

Comment 1:

Comment 2:

Comment 3:

Comment 4:

Latitude:

Longitude:

Averaged Daily Totals

0.000000
0.000000

Combined

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	> 26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	2	43	42	77	70	55	111	95	97	100	148	840
Monday	0	0	0	2	11	13	16	40	36	66	111	106	119	196	716
Tuesday	0	0	0	1	8	17	31	40	61	70	100	112	107	172	719
Wednesday	0	0	0	2	7	19	25	35	54	61	94	112	119	173	701
Thursday	0	0	0	0	7	32	34	42	47	69	106	120	108	159	724
Friday	0	0	0	1	3	17	17	32	44	63	89	114	101	174	655
Saturday	0	0	0	1	4	22	22	32	35	54	88	98	79	150	585
Total	0	0	0	9	83	162	222	291	332	494	683	759	733	1,172	4,940

Unknown, 1

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	> 26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	2	40	30	56	50	37	65	48	46	27	38	439
Monday	0	0	0	2	11	8	18	18	18	32	50	41	37	42	262
Tuesday	0	0	0	1	5	4	10	19	31	35	46	46	27	35	259
Wednesday	0	0	0	2	6	7	13	21	31	38	46	46	40	26	252
Thursday	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	12	22	37	54	45	38	23	240
Friday	0	0	0	1	4	2	15	19	19	33	48	39	32	30	222
Saturday	0	0	0	0	3	16	14	22	18	23	36	33	27	32	224
Total	0	0	0	8	66	70	100	147	166	263	328	296	228	226	1,898

Unknown, 2

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	> 26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	0	3	12	21	20	18	46	47	51	73	140	401
Monday	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	22	18	34	61	65	82	154	454
Tuesday	0	0	0	0	2	8	18	17	25	33	49	59	78	132	421
Wednesday	0	0	0	0	1	11	14	12	20	18	46	69	75	127	393
Thursday	0	0	0	0	6	25	27	28	22	26	44	75	67	118	458
Friday	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	13	15	20	40	70	63	125	365
Saturday	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	10	17	31	52	65	52	118	361
Total	0	0	0	1	13	79	108	122	135	208	339	454	490	884	2,833

5

Independence Street

The attached traffic study was conducted on Independence Street from January 18, 2016 through January 25, 2016. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Independence Street was 11,063. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 30 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department

One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Page 1

Site Code: 00000001
Station ID:
IFO 24 Independence Street
S Broadway (Route 9)
Latitude: 0' 0.0000 South

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
1/18/2016	0	1	9	41	102	98	29	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	287
1/19/2016	0	6	20	55	196	278	86	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	651
1/20/2016	0	8	23	67	209	290	101	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	710
1/21/2016	0	4	23	65	228	291	92	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	714
1/22/2016	0	5	22	61	216	292	119	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	728
1/23/2016	0	8	17	15	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	51
1/24/2016	0	4	26	51	42	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
1/25/2016	0	2	8	39	105	66	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232
East Total	0	38	148	394	1106	1332	441	51	2	0	1	0	0	0	3513

85 percentile = 29

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
1/18/2016	0	1	10	34	209	293	108	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	670
1/19/2016	0	1	23	68	392	607	234	55	1	0	0	0	0	0	1381
1/20/2016	0	5	32	99	424	653	270	46	4	0	0	0	0	0	1533
1/21/2016	0	4	33	131	451	629	229	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	1526
1/22/2016	0	2	39	91	445	689	298	82	10	1	0	0	0	0	1657
1/23/2016	0	2	27	33	26	12	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	105
1/24/2016	0	3	19	75	108	75	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
1/25/2016	0	0	11	51	159	120	29	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	376
West Total	0	18	194	582	2214	3078	1189	253	18	3	0	0	0	1	7550

85 percentile = 30

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
1/18/2016	0	2	19	75	311	391	137	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	957
1/19/2016	0	7	43	123	588	885	320	65	1	0	0	0	0	0	2032
1/20/2016	0	13	55	166	633	943	371	58	4	0	0	0	0	0	2243
1/21/2016	0	8	56	196	679	920	321	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	2240
1/22/2016	0	7	61	152	661	981	417	94	11	1	0	0	0	0	2385
1/23/2016	0	10	44	48	34	14	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	156
1/24/2016	0	7	45	126	150	90	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
1/25/2016	0	2	19	90	264	186	41	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	608
Combined Total	0	56	342	976	3320	4410	1630	304	20	3	1	0	0	1	11063

85 percentile = 30



Independence Street

The attached traffic study was conducted on Independence Street from June 21, 2019 through June 28, 2019. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Independence Street was 12,580. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 29 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department

One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Page 1

Site Code: 00000001
Station ID:
IFO #24 Independence St
S Broadway
Latitude: 0' 0.0000 South

Westbound															
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
6/21/2019	0	2	13	43	145	98	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
6/22/2019	0	5	16	55	179	145	42	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
6/23/2019	0	3	16	40	160	110	21	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	355
6/24/2019	0	13	40	84	241	224	62	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	670
6/25/2019	0	11	27	73	271	227	49	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	665
6/26/2019	0	10	34	106	287	257	54	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	753
6/27/2019	0	4	17	70	236	266	69	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	665
6/28/2019	0	5	18	51	246	226	52	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	603
Westbound Total	0	53	181	522	1765	1553	370	34	2	0	0	0	0	0	4480

85 percentile = 28

Eastbound															
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
6/21/2019	0	7	25	60	253	335	125	20	5	0	0	0	0	0	830
6/22/2019	0	3	27	50	244	353	141	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	832
6/23/2019	0	0	30	64	189	289	110	17	5	0	0	0	0	0	704
6/24/2019	0	15	146	87	314	368	117	30	4	0	0	0	0	0	1081
6/25/2019	0	2	27	108	368	437	156	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	1115
6/26/2019	0	5	41	120	411	485	151	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1236
6/27/2019	0	0	40	96	409	451	136	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	1148
6/28/2019	0	0	40	123	432	399	145	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	1154
Eastbound Total	0	32	376	708	2620	3117	1081	140	25	1	0	0	0	0	8100

85 percentile = 30

															Combined
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
6/21/2019	0	9	38	103	398	433	146	23	5	0	0	0	0	0	1155
6/22/2019	0	8	43	105	423	498	183	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	1276
6/23/2019	0	3	46	104	349	399	131	22	5	0	0	0	0	0	1059
6/24/2019	0	28	186	171	555	592	179	34	6	0	0	0	0	0	1751
6/25/2019	0	13	54	181	639	664	205	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	1780
6/26/2019	0	15	75	226	698	742	205	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1989
6/27/2019	0	4	57	166	645	717	205	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	1813
6/28/2019	0	5	58	174	678	625	197	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	1757
Combined Total	0	85	557	1230	4385	4670	1451	174	27	1	0	0	0	0	12580

85 percentile = 29

Independence Street

The attached traffic study was conducted on Independence Street from September 18, 2019 through September 25, 2019. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Independence Street was 10,516. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 28 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department

One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Page 1

Site Code: 00000000
Station ID:
IFO #24 Independence St
Latitude: 0' 0.0000 South

Westbound															
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
9/18/2019	0	1	15	48	153	124	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
9/19/2019	0	4	9	83	263	241	52	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	659
9/20/2019	0	8	24	77	289	208	38	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	650
9/21/2019	0	22	83	141	203	91	24	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
9/22/2019	0	6	21	75	138	87	14	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	345
9/23/2019	0	7	30	80	238	216	40	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	615
9/24/2019	0	4	24	96	268	160	26	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	584
9/25/2019	0	2	15	57	153	109	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Westbound Total	0	54	221	657	1705	1236	238	26	7	1	0	0	0	0	4145
95 percentile = 32															

85 percentile = 27

Eastbound															
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
9/18/2019	0	0	17	57	210	208	59	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	558
9/19/2019	0	0	33	105	354	365	104	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	981
9/20/2019	0	0	26	136	373	368	98	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	1016
9/21/2019	0	4	97	192	310	223	63	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	901
9/22/2019	0	1	33	84	213	205	65	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	604
9/23/2019	0	3	26	82	324	325	83	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	850
9/24/2019	0	1	34	130	363	317	92	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	950
9/25/2019	0	2	30	95	204	148	27	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Eastbound Total	0	11	296	881	2351	2159	591	74	4	4	0	0	0	0	6371
95 percentile = 20															

85 percentile = 29

Combined															Total
Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
9/18/2019	0	1	32	105	363	332	79	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	923
9/19/2019	0	4	42	188	617	606	156	25	2	0	0	0	0	0	1640
9/20/2019	0	8	50	213	662	576	136	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	1686
9/21/2019	0	26	180	333	513	314	87	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1467
9/22/2019	0	7	54	159	351	292	79	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	949
9/23/2019	0	10	56	162	562	541	123	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1485
9/24/2019	0	5	58	226	631	477	118	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	1534
9/25/2019	0	4	45	152	357	257	51	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	872
Combined Total	0	65	517	1538	4056	3395	829	100	11	5	0	0	0	0	10516
95 percentile = 20															

85 percentile = 28

Independence Street

The attached traffic study was conducted on Independence Street from October 5, 2020 through October 12, 2020. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Independence Street was 6,650. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 24.9 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department

One Depot Plaza

Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Site Code: 00000001

Station ID:

Location 1: *Walden Ave St.*

Location 2:

Location 3:

Location 4:

Comment 1:

Comment 2:

Comment 3:

Comment 4:

Latitude:

Longitude:

Averaged Daily Totals

0.000000
0.000000

Combined

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	4	6	22	30	38	96	129	161	144	103	68	801
Monday	0	0	0	0	1	20	24	34	68	114	129	124	70	53	637
Tuesday	0	0	0	1	5	13	21	63	94	125	166	151	94	96	829
Wednesday	0	0	0	1	4	19	41	59	98	151	154	141	90	65	823
Thursday	0	0	0	0	5	20	24	63	93	154	186	161	106	68	880
Friday	0	0	0	1	10	30	54	81	151	254	249	182	124	89	1,225
Saturday	0	0	0	8	17	37	59	131	170	261	257	241	149	125	1,455
Total	0	0	0	15	48	161	253	469	770	1,188	1,302	1,144	736	564	6,650

East, 1

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	2	5	10	10	11	34	43	43	51	37	23	269
Monday	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	10	17	25	45	48	22	18	204
Tuesday	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	12	39	37	45	42	31	30	251
Wednesday	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	18	31	47	47	56	30	22	273
Thursday	0	0	0	0	5	8	13	20	31	56	62	56	38	27	316
Friday	0	0	0	1	10	23	23	48	70	70	83	56	36	37	394
Saturday	0	0	0	8	16	22	32	52	68	68	68	58	35	29	456
Total	0	0	0	12	41	66	109	146	268	346	393	367	229	186	2,163

West, 2

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	2	1	12	20	27	62	86	118	93	66	45	532
Monday	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	21	50	84	83	73	40	32	397
Tuesday	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	45	51	89	113	103	65	61	544
Wednesday	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	36	66	105	106	92	57	38	523
Thursday	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	42	61	99	128	101	64	39	554
Friday	0	0	0	0	0	23	31	58	103	184	166	126	88	52	831
Saturday	0	0	0	0	1	15	27	79	102	193	189	183	114	96	999
Total	0	0	0	2	2	74	128	308	495	840	903	771	494	363	4,380

Park Avenue

The attached traffic study was conducted on Park Avenue from November 10, 2020 through November 17, 2020. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Independence Street was 4,387. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 22.9 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department
One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Site Code: 00000000

Station ID:

Location 1: Park Avenue

Location 2: S Broadway

Location 3:

Location 4:

Averaged Daily Totals

Comment 1:
Comment 2:
Comment 3:
Comment 4:
Latitude: 0.000000
Longitude: 0.000000

Combined

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	2	23	48	77	94	71	68	41	31	25	18	498
Monday	0	0	0	2	13	29	79	108	100	103	89	48	35	29	635
Tuesday	0	0	0	1	13	56	93	106	97	115	76	55	30	26	668
Wednesday	0	0	0	0	20	44	78	99	103	85	72	40	26	34	601
Thursday	0	0	0	6	17	39	93	127	110	105	82	61	35	34	709
Friday	0	0	0	4	12	44	73	98	94	83	69	41	29	18	565
Saturday	0	0	0	10	16	68	103	135	119	100	70	50	19	21	711
Total	0	0	0	25	114	328	596	767	694	659	499	326	199	180	4,387

East, 1

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	2	16	29	45	43	30	13	4	1	3	0	186
Monday	0	0	0	1	6	22	36	53	46	26	8	3	0	1	202
Tuesday	0	0	0	1	10	33	49	51	32	8	5	1	0	1	191
Wednesday	0	0	0	0	11	26	40	36	37	13	2	0	0	0	165
Thursday	0	0	0	5	12	21	47	59	43	16	4	2	0	0	209
Friday	0	0	0	3	11	21	46	66	44	17	6	4	1	2	221
Saturday	0	0	0	10	12	49	60	76	49	23	13	4	0	1	297
Total	0	0	0	22	78	201	323	384	281	116	42	15	4	5	1,471

West, 2

	<= 2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	0	7	19	32	51	41	55	37	30	22	18	312
Monday	0	0	0	1	7	7	43	55	54	77	81	45	35	28	433
Tuesday	0	0	0	0	0	17	39	56	66	96	70	51	30	24	449
Wednesday	0	0	0	0	6	11	27	60	64	70	64	36	26	34	398
Thursday	0	0	0	1	3	18	43	66	65	89	76	57	35	34	487
Friday	0	0	0	1	1	23	27	32	50	66	63	37	28	16	344
Saturday	0	0	0	0	4	19	43	59	70	79	57	46	19	20	414
Total	0	0	0	3	28	114	254	379	410	530	448	302	195	174	2,837

Riverview Avenue

The attached traffic study was conducted on Riverview Avenue from January 8, 2016 through January 12, 2016. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Riverview Avenue was 7,711. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 32 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department

One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Page 1

Site Code: 00000001

Station ID:

IFO 24 Riverview Ave (1:21pm to 1:18am)

Franklin St.

Latitude: 0' 0.0000 Undefined

Southbound

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
1/8/2016	0	9	21	76	289	184	34	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	619
1/9/2016	0	6	16	103	322	256	40	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
1/10/2016	0	179	220	100	216	127	28	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	872
1/11/2016	0	3	24	139	498	406	83	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1159
1/12/2016	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Southbound Total	0	197	281	418	1326	974	186	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	3400

85 percentile = 27

Northbound

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
1/8/2016	0	0	3	31	176	472	371	115	29	1	0	1	0	0	1199
1/9/2016	0	0	6	36	153	369	280	84	15	5	0	0	0	0	948
1/10/2016	0	3	25	35	110	235	185	59	6	3	0	0	0	0	661
1/11/2016	0	0	6	30	235	612	475	110	22	5	0	0	0	1	1496
1/12/2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Northbound Total	0	3	40	132	674	1688	1317	368	73	14	0	1	0	1	4311

85 percentile = 34

Combined

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
1/8/2016	0	9	24	107	465	656	405	120	30	1	0	1	0	0	1818
1/9/2016	0	6	22	139	475	625	320	88	15	5	0	0	0	0	1695
1/10/2016	0	182	245	135	326	362	213	61	6	3	0	0	0	0	1533
1/11/2016	0	3	30	169	733	1018	558	114	23	5	0	0	0	2	2655
1/12/2016	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Combined Total	0	200	321	550	2000	2662	1503	383	75	14	0	1	0	2	7711

85 percentile = 32

Riverview Avenue

The attached traffic study was conducted on Riverview Avenue from June 21, 2019 through June 27, 2019. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Riverview Avenue was 15,095. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 29 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department

One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Page 1

Site Code: 00000000
Station ID:
IFO #24 Riverview Avenue
Glen Street
Latitude: 0' 0.0000 South

Southbound

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
6/21/2019	0	3	14	52	273	353	94	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	800
6/22/2019	0	4	11	78	338	330	89	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	856
6/23/2019	0	2	7	40	240	284	89	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	670
6/24/2019	0	2	17	104	675	605	135	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	1553
6/25/2019	0	1	10	102	547	448	95	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	1218
6/26/2019	0	8	25	139	571	479	98	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1330
6/27/2019	0	6	14	122	551	461	104	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	1276
Southbound Total	0	26	98	637	3195	2960	704	74	9	0	0	0	0	0	7703

85 percentile = 29

Northbound

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
6/21/2019	0	1	9	35	205	322	62	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	642
6/22/2019	0	2	22	58	280	390	94	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	852
6/23/2019	0	2	23	50	208	305	70	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	674
6/24/2019	0	0	33	90	392	645	148	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	1323
6/25/2019	0	1	39	58	403	571	163	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	1251
6/26/2019	0	3	28	74	482	683	132	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	1414
6/27/2019	0	1	23	77	385	604	137	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	1236
Northbound Total	0	10	177	442	2355	3520	806	74	8	0	0	0	0	0	7392

85 percentile = 29

Combined

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
6/21/2019	0	4	23	87	478	675	156	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	1442
6/22/2019	0	6	33	136	618	720	183	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	1708
6/23/2019	0	4	30	90	448	589	159	20	4	0	0	0	0	0	1344
6/24/2019	0	2	50	194	1067	1250	283	27	3	0	0	0	0	0	2876
6/25/2019	0	2	49	160	950	1019	258	30	1	0	0	0	0	0	2469
6/26/2019	0	11	53	213	1053	1162	230	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	2744
6/27/2019	0	7	37	199	936	1065	241	21	6	0	0	0	0	0	2512
Combined Total	0	36	275	1079	5550	6480	1510	148	17	0	0	0	0	0	15095

85 percentile = 29

Riverview Avenue

The attached traffic study was conducted on Riverview Avenue from September 18, 2019 through September 23, 2019. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Riverview Avenue was 10,292. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 29 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department

One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Page 1

Site Code: 00000801
Station ID:
Riverview Av
Glen Street
Latitude: 0' 0.0000 South

Southbound

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
9/18/2019	0	1	13	90	345	223	66	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	748
9/19/2019	0	5	15	111	416	457	141	24	3	0	0	0	0	0	1172
9/20/2019	0	1	21	132	496	445	136	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1254
9/21/2019	0	1	7	106	337	280	87	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	839
9/22/2019	0	0	10	86	264	189	48	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	607
9/23/2019	0	2	7	83	209	115	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	438
Southbound Total	0	10	73	608	2067	1709	498	77	15	1	0	0	0	0	5058

85 percentile = 29

Northbound

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
9/18/2019	0	0	29	56	201	306	81	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	678
9/19/2019	0	2	28	84	428	571	142	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	1274
9/20/2019	0	1	23	62	306	603	207	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	1225
9/21/2019	0	0	26	70	287	369	117	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	888
9/22/2019	0	1	12	42	178	275	92	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	612
9/23/2019	0	2	3	27	149	277	87	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Northbound Total	0	6	121	341	1549	2401	726	80	10	0	0	0	0	0	5234

85 percentile = 30

Combined

Date\Speed (MPH)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	>65	Total
9/18/2019	0	1	42	146	546	529	147	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	1426
9/19/2019	0	7	43	195	844	1028	283	38	8	0	0	0	0	0	2446
9/20/2019	0	2	44	194	802	1048	343	40	5	1	0	0	0	0	2479
9/21/2019	0	1	33	176	624	649	204	32	8	0	0	0	0	0	1727
9/22/2019	0	1	22	128	442	464	140	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	1219
9/23/2019	0	4	10	110	358	392	107	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	995
Combined Total	0	16	194	949	3616	4110	1224	157	25	1	0	0	0	0	10292

85 percentile = 29

Riverview Avenue

The attached traffic study was conducted on Riverview Avenue from October 5, 2020 through October 12, 2020. During that period, the combined total of vehicles that travelled on Riverview Avenue was 8,683. The 85th percentile for vehicular speed was 18.9 mph. Traffic study documentation attached.

Village of Tarrytown Police Department
One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

Site Code:

00000000

Station ID:

Riverview Avenue
Glen Street

Location 1:

Location 2:

Location 3:

Location 4:

Comment 1:

Comment 2:

Comment 3:

Comment 4:

Latitude:

Longitude:

0.000000

0.000000

Averaged Daily Totals

Combined

	<=2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	11	103	172	251	207	155	83	35	21	8	8	1,054
Monday	0	0	0	9	94	158	201	160	104	81	37	14	5	2	865
Tuesday	0	0	0	8	105	181	260	232	149	104	57	30	7	4	1,137
Wednesday	0	0	0	11	118	225	292	218	146	115	54	36	9	6	1,230
Thursday	0	0	0	12	93	214	285	206	159	92	43	25	13	14	1,156
Friday	0	0	0	16	108	189	352	319	235	142	78	43	21	20	1,523
Saturday	0	0	0	17	171	304	396	381	240	129	72	40	19	19	1,718
Total	0	0	0	84	792	1,443	2,037	1,653	1,188	746	376	209	82	73	8,683

South, 1

	<=2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	11	86	91	94	82	61	38	9	7	2	1	482
Monday	0	0	0	9	79	87	77	54	41	30	13	6	1	1	398
Tuesday	0	0	0	8	98	91	94	71	53	35	17	6	0	0	473
Wednesday	0	0	0	9	103	125	109	78	62	46	12	6	0	2	552
Thursday	0	0	0	10	77	101	112	67	62	36	12	12	4	4	497
Friday	0	0	0	16	95	94	127	108	92	53	28	22	11	8	654
Saturday	0	0	0	16	152	178	152	107	100	50	28	12	3	5	803
Total	0	0	0	79	690	767	765	567	471	288	119	71	21	21	3,859

North, 2

	<=2	>2 to 4	>4 to 6	>6 to 8	>8 to 10	>10 to 12	>12 to 14	>14 to 16	>16 to 18	>18 to 20	>20 to 22	>22 to 24	>24 to 26	>26	Total
Sunday	0	0	0	0	17	81	157	125	94	45	26	14	6	7	572
Monday	0	0	0	0	10	67	129	106	65	46	21	8	2	1	455
Tuesday	0	0	0	0	7	90	164	155	90	67	36	20	3	1	633
Wednesday	0	0	0	0	14	104	186	136	86	68	37	23	4	1	659
Thursday	0	0	0	2	14	113	175	141	94	56	31	10	8	10	654
Friday	0	0	0	0	13	95	225	211	143	89	50	21	10	12	869
Saturday	0	0	0	1	19	126	244	204	140	79	44	28	16	14	915
Total	0	0	0	3	94	676	1,280	1,078	712	450	245	124	49	46	4,757



**FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT®
FOR HEALTHY LIVING
FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

December 23, 2020

Richard Slingerland
Village Administrator
Village of Tarrytown
One Depot Plaza
Tarrytown, NY 10591

Re: Special Use Permit: Family YMCA of Tarrytown at EF Lugari School Building

Dear Mr. Slingerland:

As you are aware, the Family YMCA at Tarrytown made the strategic decision to sell our building at 62 Main Street in an effort to better serve our community. We purposely selected an accomplished developer, Wilder Balter, to redevelop the site. As you've been able to witness through his approval process, this development will be a win-win for the Village, our current residents and the Y.

That being said, Balter's offer to purchase and redevelop our building was no guarantee that his plan would be approved or that his public funding sources would be available. The Covid-19 pandemic further complicated matters and uncertainty to the extent we had to renegotiate the terms of the sale agreement. Therefore, our relocation plans were postponed until we had greater certainty. As you can imagine, we do not have the resources to buy/lease a new space and continue to operate our building at 62 Main Street. Therefore, we explored potential locations but could not commit until Balter received his final site plan approval at the November Planning Board meeting. Additionally, due to the pandemic, we decided to find a temporary location to house our childcare and school age remote learning and care programs as those have been the most needed services to the community. Our fitness and recreation services will resume post-pandemic when people feel comfortable exercising indoors again.

Therefore, we are proposing to relocate our childcare and school age remote learning programs to the EF campus. Over the years we've had a good working relationship with EF and they are willing to lease us dedicated space for these programs for a 2-year period, at which point we would have secured and developed our permanent new home.

I am writing to you and the Village Board to explain our situation and that to request a special use permit for EF to house a childcare center during this interim timeframe. Balter's plan is to close on the sale of our building in March of 2021, at which time we would have to vacate the building. Therefore, even if we were to obtain planning

6

board approval at the December meeting, we have less than 90 days to complete the renovations necessary to accommodate childcare and gain licensing through the New York State Office of Children and Family Services. It's a very tight window and we cannot let our families down. We have retained Dennis Noskin as our architect with whom we have a good working rapport and whose reputation speaks for itself in an effort to make this process go as smoothly as possible. We are willing and able to provide the Village Board whatever is necessary to help expedite this process and meet our deadline.

Lastly, I would like to share with the board information about the population we serve. Even with reduced enrollments due to the impact of the pandemic, we are still serving over 50 children, all of which need the care as their parent(s) need to physically go to work. This is the most at-risk population. Over 60% of our families are below the median income in Westchester and over 80% of our participants receive financial aid from our Y to participate. These are needed programs that are heavily subsidized through grants and private donations. We are the only childcare provider in our area that stayed open throughout the pandemic as emergency and essential workers needed affordable childcare for their children. Today, we are providing full-day school age care and remote learning assistance 3 days per week for kids who attend John Paulding, Morse and WI as part of the Tarrytown School Districts hybrid school model. The other 2 days, the children come after school. And when there is a school closure due to an outbreak the kids come all day for all 5 days of the week at no extra expense to the parents.

Thank you for your time and patience as you hear our plea.

Sincerely,

Gerry Riera

Gerry Riera

Chief Executive Officer

Village of Tarrytown, NY
Wednesday, December 23, 2020

Chapter 305. Zoning

Article IV. Single-Family Residential Zones

§ 305-18. Residential R-20 Zone.

The following requirements, standards and conditions apply to the Residential R-20 Zone:

A. Permitted principal uses.

- (1) One-family detached dwellings.
- (2) Churches, synagogues, parish houses and buildings for religious education on sites of not less than two acres and which shall meet all other area and dimensional requirements of the particular district within which they are located. No more than two persons unrelated by blood, adoption or marriage shall reside therein, living and/or functioning together as a single nonprofit housekeeping unit, exclusive of household servants not exceeding two in number.
- (3) Municipal uses.
- (4) Buildings and facilities for a private or cooperative limited-membership community center on sites of not less than 1 1/2 acres each.
- (5) As to two- or three-family dwellings, the third floor of any building shall not be used as a separate dwelling unit but may be used for storage or for sleeping rooms appurtenant to the second-floor dwelling unit.

B. Permitted accessory uses.

- (1) The raising of ornamental and food crops for use only by occupants of such property.
- (2) A noncommercial greenhouse on any lot in excess of 6,000 square feet in the rear yard only, provided that it does not exceed 2% of the lot area in ground coverage; similarly, a child's playhouse shall be permitted, provided that it shall not exceed 1% of the lot area.
- (3) The keeping of dogs and cats as household pets, provided that the total number of such pets shall not exceed five animals over the age of six months.
- (4) The keeping of not more than two boarders or lodgers by a resident family or person, provided that the resultant density of occupancy does not exceed two persons for each bedroom in the applicable premises. A boarder/lodger occupancy permit shall be required for each boarder or lodger proposed to be established. Said boarder/lodger permit shall be automatically null and void one year from the date of its issuance or upon changing of ownership of the host property, whichever shall occur earliest, and may be renewed upon inspection and certification by the Code Enforcement Officer as being in compliance with the requirements of this chapter and the State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code. Notwithstanding other requirements of this chapter, no boarder/lodger permit shall be granted by the Code Enforcement Officer unless said officer certifies that at least one off-street parking space has been provided and is available for the use of said boarder and/or lodger in addition to other off-street parking space requirements which may exist. Five years from the adoption date of this chapter, any host property which maintains in excess of the maximum number of boarders or lodgers as permitted and regulated in this section shall reduce said occupancy so as to comply with these maximum occupancy provisions.

- 6
- (5) A customary incidental home occupation conducted solely by the owner of the home residing on the premises, provided that:
 - (a) There is no outside display.
 - (b) No more than 1/2 of the area of one floor of the dwelling unit is so used.
 - (c) Only customary household appliances and equipment are used.
 - (d) No nonresidents are employed therein.
 - (6) Professional offices or studios, provided that:
 - (a) The professional office existed prior to September 5, 1989, and said professional office was in full compliance with the Village of Tarrytown Zoning Code, as amended, as of September 5, 1989.
 - (b) The owner of the home resides therein.
 - (c) The owner of the home maintains her or his professional office or studio therein.
 - (d) Not more than two assistants shall be employed at the same time in the office of any doctor or dentist and not more than one employee in any other professional office listed.
 - (e) The term "professional" is limited to those occupations listed in Title VIII of the Education Law of the State of New York, Article 15 of the Judiciary Law of the State of New York and Article 15 of the Business Corporation Law of the State of New York.
 - (7) Accessory private garage space for not more than one private passenger vehicle for each 5,000 square feet of lot area, except that garage space for two such private vehicles shall be permitted on any lot of 5,000 square feet or more, and one commercial vehicle belonging to the owner or lessee of such lot may be kept in a fully enclosed structure. Such garage space may be within, under or directly connected by a breezeway to the principal building, or on lots of 7,500 square feet or more may be separated from such principal building, but space for not more than one private passenger vehicle may be leased to a nonresident of the premises.
 - (8) Organized child-care facilities, including but not limited to nursery schools and day-care centers, designed and licensed by the State of New York to conduct the care and feeding of children of preschool and elementary school age, subject to site plan approval by the Planning Board.
 - (9) Swimming pools. (See § 305-54.)
 - (10) Tents, trailers, boats, recreation vehicles and mobile homes. (See § 305-55.)
 - (11) Solar heating devices. (See § 305-56.)
 - (12) Wind-energy devices. (See § 305-57.)
 - (13) Tennis courts. (See § 305-58.)
 - (14) Other accessory structures, such as toolhouses, a child's playhouse, wading pools, outdoor fireplaces or drying yards, not to be located in any front yard or to be nearer to any side or rear lot line than the distance specified in the yard requirements.

C. Uses requiring compatible use permits.

- (1) A public, sectarian or private elementary or secondary school, college, university, theological or trade or industrial school with or without assembly and residence halls with customary incidental facilities, whether or not operated for gain or profit. (See § 305-128.)
- (2) Institutional housing. (See § 305-127.)

- (3) In structures certified by the Board of Trustees as historic structures, the Zoning Board of Appeals may permit the conversion of a one-family dwelling into a maximum of three separate dwelling units where such conversion is necessary to preserve the historic structures, provided that each dwelling unit shall contain the minimum livable floor area required in that district and further subject to the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness by the Architectural Review Board.

D. Minimum lot area: 20,000 square feet.

Village of Tarrytown, NY
Wednesday, December 23, 2020

Chapter 305. Zoning

Article XV. Compatible Use Permits

§ 305-128. Educational institutions.

In all residential districts, subject to the granting of a compatible use permit, a public, sectarian or private elementary or secondary school, college, university, theological, trade or industrial school with or without assembly and residence halls with customary incidental facilities may be permitted, whether or not operated for gain or profit, subject to compliance with this section and the following specific requirements. The Board of Trustees may impose such reasonable and appropriate conditions, restrictions and safeguards as it may deem necessary or desirable to protect the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the Village.

- A. Off-street parking: as required by § 305-63D, except that there shall be at least one space for every three students plus one space for each faculty member or employee attending or on duty at any particular time in addition to parking requirements for other uses specified in § 305-63D. In the course of site plan approval, the Planning Board may permit dual usage of parking areas or other techniques for reducing paved parking area in the interest of lessening adverse environmental impact.
- B. Lot limitations pertaining to § 305-11, the schedule controlling land and buildings,^[1] for compatible use permit educational use:

Bulk Regulation	Limitations
Minimum lot size	10 acres
Width at front of building	135 feet (same as R-30)
Principal building coverage	15%
Accessory building coverage	15%
Total coverage (for all buildings)	30%
Minimum front yard	35 feet
Minimum for each side yard	18 feet
Minimum 2 side yards	38 feet
Minimum rear yard	34 feet
Minimum distance from accessory building to principal building	18 feet
Minimum distance from accessory building to side lot line	18 feet
Minimum distance from accessory building to rear lot line	18 feet

NOTE: All buildings and structures shall be located at such distance from any lot line and from any other building or structure as the Planning Board shall find to be necessary or advisable in a particular case, but in any event not less than 100 feet from any such lot line.

[1] *Editor's Note: The schedule is included at the end of this chapter.*

- C. Miscellaneous standards pertaining to § 305-11, the schedule controlling land and buildings,^[2] parking and other criteria:
- (1) Maximum height for indoor recreational and athletic facilities: 50 feet (2 1/2 stories).
 - (2) Residential and instructional and all other structures: as in R-30.

6 (3) Minimum livable floor area, etc.: as in R-30.

(4) Park and waterfront access: In the course of site plan review, the Planning Board shall ensure adequate public access to waterfronts and public parkland adjacent or in close proximity to the compatible use permit use by the establishment of access or sight easements, land donations or dedications and other techniques.

(5) All land defined as wetlands or having a slope equal to or greater than 25% as defined by the Planning Board as being within the confines of a particular educational institution compatible use permit use shall be excluded from use or development, and 50% of such wetlands and steep slope areas shall be excluded from consideration in the calculation of building coverage and floor space.

[2] *Editor's Note: The schedule is included at the end of this chapter.*