MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE VILLAGE OF BRONXVILLE HELD ON JANUARY 11, 2012 AT THE VILLAGE HALL, 200 PONDFIELD ROAD, BRONXVILLE, N.Y.

* * * * * *

PRESENT:	Donald Henderson	Chairman
	Anna Longobardo	Vice Chair
	James Murray	Member
	Adrienne Smith	Member
	Eric Blessing	Member
	Gary Reetz	Alternate
	Vincent Pici	Superintendent of Buildings
EXCUSED:	Randolph Mayer	Alternate

* * * * * *

Chairman Henderson called to order the regular meeting at 7:30PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion of Ms. Smith, second by Mr. Murray, the Board approved the minutes of the Regular Meeting on December 14, 2011.

SITE DEVELOPMENT – Rivermere Apartments (patio doors and window replacements)

Mr. Dennis Ryan, contractor from Renewal by Anderson Company, said that his company was selected by Rivermere to replace the windows and doors. They are looking for approval. He introduced Ted Nichols who is the President of the Board of Directors for the Rivermere Corporation.

Ms. Longobardo asked Mr. Ryan to speak about the extent of the project and mentioned that there will be ten (10) different sized windows. She also asked him to show an example of a window.

Mr. Ryan explained that the sample he provided shows the exterior of the window which will be white with white trim. The grill patterns will be colonial style and uniform for each individual size. Some of the windows have a fixed window above the trim of the operational windows. This is a major cost saving for Rivermere. Also keeping the grill pattern up and down will keep uniformity. The window is made of Fibrex which was developed by Anderson. It is a very strong and stable material that does not warp or rot and is resistant to mildew. It is a very reliable window. Rivermere and Andersen are trying to preserve the architectural detail as much as possible by keeping the casement windows. His company is building the windows for the existing openings. It is a high quality, high end casement window. This project will be done in a phased in period. The first phase is for the patio doors – replacing all patio doors over 90 days. Some of the apartment owners may wish to have their windows simultaneously done.

Ms. Longobardo reported that the Design Review Committee was impressed with the material, glazing, energy efficiency and felt that Andersen windows are very reliable.

Mr. Ryan responded that he has documentation from customers who have the windows. He showed a sample of the trim made of Fibrex. He explained that Andersen can create an architectural match for the outside but on the inside the homeowner can select different finishes. This offers flexibility.

Mr. Ryan went on to discuss this new division of Andersen that was started in 1995. The windows are manufactured and installed by Andersen. The warranty is for 10 years on non-glass and 20 years for the glass which includes the cost of making the repairs.

Mr. Murray inquired about the tenants and if they will be required to change the windows and if they do not how the building will look architecturally.

Mr. Ryan responded that sooner or later everyone will have to replace their windows and because of the cost Rivermere is trying to work it out fairly.

Mr. Nichols commented that the proper way to do this project is to finance this as a capital improvement project over time. The building will refinance and will do the remainder of the windows then. Some owners will do their windows now as they cannot open them.

Mr. Ryan said as the windows are replaced over time there will be architectural consistency.

Ms. Longobardo reported that this was approved by the Design Review Committee.

Mr. Vincent Pici, Superintendent of Buildings, said all specifications will be part of the condition of the issuance of a building permit.

Chairman Henderson opened the public hearing at 7:50PM.

Mr. Stephen Dougherty, Rivermere resident, said that he met with Mr. Pici and that the drawings of September 2009 include over 30 errors and omissions. These include wrong size windows and doors. He questions how the Planning Board can approve this project.

Ms. Longobardo said that the although the current drawings show double hung windows the applicant has said that these will all be casement windows and the drawings will be corrected. Any approval would have requirements that the schedule and diagrams be presented for final approval.

Mr. Dougherty reiterated that the drawings show wrong size windows and windows going where no windows exist.

Mr. Pici commented that if the style and window is an issue for this Board he suggests that the Board condition the window size and the location whereby there will only be replacements and not new windows.

Mr. Pici responded that the conditions can be put in the site plan or the drawings.

Chairman Henderson closed the public hearing at 7:55PM.

Chairman Henderson asked for a motion to grant the site development plan approval. It was unanimously passed on motion of Mr. Blessing, second by Mr. Murray.

SITE DEVELOPMENT – Lawrence Hospital – Oxygen Tank Replacements

Ms. Rachel Sheets, Engineer for applicant, indicated that plans would be revised to provide additional information requested.

The matter was postponed to the next meeting pending inclusion of additional information requested by the Planning Board's consultants.

SITE DEVELOPMENT – 55 Palmer Avenue (Lawrence Hospital Cancer Center)

Kathy Zalantis, attorney for applicant, reported that at the last meeting there were two outstanding issues – utilities and construction management. The hospital has submitted to the Village's consultant a report on both issues as they have been addressed satisfactorily. They are waiting for comments from the Fire Department and once received they will be submitted to the Planning Board. The hospital has submitted a new EAF with an addendum. The revised EAF was revised reflecting comments made by the Planning Board. The hospital has reduced the square footage of the proposed addition, added an alternative section to the EAF, added a Village Community Plan section, and has included comments from interested and involved agencies. The Addendum A looks at the environmental issues. The scope of the project has changed since it was first presented. Regarding zoning, there is the elimination of some variances. The Village consultant reviewed the traffic issues and found there is will be no significant impact. With regard to parking, only a limited amount of additional spaces will be utilized. Site distances were determined to not be a problem by the Chief of Police. Drainage/stormwater will have no impact with respect to SEQRA. Noise issues brought some disagreement amongst consultants but it was determined that there will be no impact by all consultants. There will be no impact on State or local historical places. The hospital has incorporated all suggestions with regard to community services. All hazardous materials and their handling have been reviewed and no issues here. The construction management plan has satisfied all issues. There have been extensive design changes made with regard to visual resources and open space.

Ms. Zalantis asked that the Planning Board direct its consultants to draw up a draft environmental determination report for the next meeting. She also said that the Planning Board made this a Type 1 classification and she asked to have this be listed as an unlisted option.

Chairman Henderson said he received the letter from the Fire Department and inquired about the sprinkler system being mentioned and if there was anything in the letter that was not covered by the plan.

Mr. Tim Becker, architect for applicant, responded that the mention of sprinklers in the letter is required by the building code and that everything will be in full compliance.

Ms. Marilyn Timpone-Mohammed, consultant from F.P. Clarke Associates, spoke of the January 6, 2012 memo which discussed all of the technical issues being resolved and expanding the environmental impact determination. She is reviewing this with Village Attorney, James Staudt, to make sure it is accurate and the Planning Board can accept the document and then make an environmental determination of significance. She said that the Planning Board should direct the consultants to prepare a determination of significance.

Chairman Henderson responded that the Planning Board will pass on this and that Village Attorney, James Staudt, will prepare a resolution when appropriate. He then asked Ms. Zalantis to give an update on the applicant's meeting with the Zoning Board.

Ms. Zalantis reported that the applicant got through all of the variances, the FAR issues, the setback issues and will be going back at the end of this month.

Chairman Henderson opened the public hearing at 8:15PM.

Ms. Helen Levitz, Westborne resident, said that the neighbors do not agree that this should be reclassified from a Type 1. A full EIS process would have more input from the neighbors. They are annoyed by the commercials that are being run by the hospital showing lots of trees when these trees will be removed once this project begins. If this is a community hospital why does the hospital feel the need to advertise? This is an area hospital and does community service for the area which offers benefits and negatives. Regarding property values, collectively Alger Court buildings are the highest taxpayers in the Village and they do not use a lot of Village services. The neighbors do not want to hurt the reputation of the hospital. They wish this was limited to a land use issue. She has read the revised application and addenda and there was no trade-off. In the late 1970's, there was a discussion of knocking down the north tower and leaving open space.

Ms. Levitz suggested that the Planning Board follow the tradition of doing an EIS and really look at the benefits versus the burdens. The benefits should be for the entire Village and the burdens not just concentrated on the west side. There will be no taxes to the Village because the hospital is a not-for-profit. The real underlying issue is what would happen to the Village if the hospital was not there. The project has to be viewed coldly and rationally. The hospital has options with regard to parking. Neighbors are concerned about the footprint of the project, the noise and the drainage (the river). She has read the alternatives to the proposed footprint and these are a history of an evolution of the hospital that will be built. She asked the Planning Board to think of this as one big project for now and the future. This is not a modest addition – it represents 20% of the entire campus. The noise will definitely be increased as new regulations require a lot of air filtration. The river will be an off-set for all of the paved over space. Flash flooding has been happening every four (4) years. The roof garden design was innovative in the hope to alleviate water in large storms. The river basin has to drain 51,000 gallons and is it really able to handle this?

Ms. Jill Potter, daughter of Westborne resident with Alzheimers, wanted to remind everyone what Mr. Mayer said at a past meeting when he was questioning if this plan was not approved - "do we have to approve this plan?" She is upset about the idea of the project moving forward, wonders what happens if the hospital closes, and questions if it is better to concentrate on making things better rather than expanding. She asked why the hospital could not build a center off-site. She feels the building is already too large.

Chairman Henderson closed the public hearing at 8:47PM.

<u>OTHER BUSINESS</u>

None.

<u>NEXT MEETING</u>

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board will be held on Wednesday, February 8, 2012 at 7:30PM.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Planning Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:48PM on motion of Mr. Blessing, second by Mr. Murray.

* * * * *

Respectfully submitted,

Karen A Buccheri

Karen A. Buccheri
Secretary to the Mayor & Village Administrator