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THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening. This is the Town of Eastchester Planning Board meeting of April 23, 2015. If everyone would rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(Whereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was said.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a full board. What a treat. Mr. Phil Nemecek.

MR. NEMECEK: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Robert Pulaski.

MR. PULASKI: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Jim Bonnano is here.

Bill West.

MR. WEST: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mark Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. So we have one, two, three, four applications today. The first is 7 Hunter Drive, the next is 18 Interlaken, the next is 102 White Road, and the last is 7 D'Ambrosio Way. The residences at Summerfield Gardens have been adjourned, as has 195 Beech Street.

So the first application is 7 Hunter,
MR. IANNACITO: Good evening. My name is John Iannacito. I'm an architect, and I'm representing Mr. and Mrs. Mike Provenzale this evening.

We are proposing an addition and alterations to the existing single family residence located at 7 Hunter Drive. The proposed scope of work will include a two story addition at the front of the existing residence, a second story addition above the existing footprint, new bay windows at the front and rear of the existing residence, a covered pergola over the existing patio, a new in-ground pool, and facade alterations.

This application was presented to the Zoning Board, and area variances were granted on March 10, 2015. The first area variance was for the total gross floor area, second was for the total impervious surface coverage, and the third was for the side and rear setbacks to the pool equipment.

Quickly go to the elevations. This is the first floor plan. The addition towards the front of the house will include a new living room, powder room, expansion of the entrance hall, new front porch, and the existing living room.
room will become the new dining room, and at the rear the existing dining and kitchen became a new kitchen/family room space.

On the second floor, we have the two story addition and the addition over the existing footprint, which will include a master suite including a bedroom, a sitting room, a bathroom and two closets, and a small office, and then these are the proposed bay windows at the existing bedrooms at the front and rear of the residence.

I have the existing and proposed front and side elevations. Here's the existing elevation and proposed two story addition with the new front porch, second story addition over existing, and the new bay windows in the bedrooms. Side elevation showing the new second story addition over the existing footprint and the two story addition at the front, existing and proposed rear and left side elevation. Here's the second story addition.
in a Navajo beige finish and a stone veneer in
an old country stone finish supplied by New
England Stone. The roof surfaces will be
asphalt in a weathered wood finish over the
main portion of the house and then copper over
the front bay and entry. The windows will be a
vinyl clad in a white finish, the trim boards
will be painted AZEK in a white finish, the
gutters will be aluminum in a white finish, and
the front door will be a stained wood.

The application was presented to the
Architectural Review Board on April 2nd, and it
was approved with one recommendation that we
submit a perspective view or rendering for the
Planning Board. I've given everyone a copy.
Thank you for your time, and I'm happy to
answer any questions you may have.
MR. NEMECEK: Did you increase the
size of the chimney?

MR. IANNACITO: The chimney on the
side will get taller, yes.
MR. NEMECEK: You're matching the
existing brick?
MR. IANNACITO: We're going to stucco
it. The existing front facade had a lot of
brick on it, so we're removing all that brick
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and changing it to stone. So we're going to have the chimney go up in stucco to match the side of the house, and the exposed foundation walls will be a stucco painted to match the siding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you point that out?

MR. IANNACITO: This is the existing chimney on the existing elevation, and this is the new elevation.

(Indicating.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Like a tan stucco?

MR. IANNACITO: Yes, to match the siding.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the cap is going to be, the chimney cap?

MR. IANNACITO: The chimney cap will also be a stucco finish.
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THE CHAIRMAN: It's very handsome.

MR. NEMECEK: The variance in the back was for just the pool equipment? The pool itself was within the --

MR. IANNACITO: The pool was okay. The equipment we decided to put in the back corner of the property here, so we needed a setback requirement. It's going to be 5 feet off the rear and the side property line, and I
believe the requirement is either 10 or 12. It was 12 feet.

(Indicating.)

MR. NEMECEK: What's directly behind the rear of the property; is that the cemetery?

MR. IANNACITO: No. This is another residence.

MR. NEMECEK: Another residence.

MR. IANNACITO: On Innisfree.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you're changing the ridge height on both roofs; right?

MR. IANNACITO: No. The ridge height is only changing on -- everything here and on this gable here is existing. So it's really the second floor here that goes up higher.
speechless. We really can't say very much.

MR. IANNACITO: That was a recommendation from the Architectural Review Board. They thought it would be easier for everyone to understand the ins and outs of the facade.

MR. NEMECEK: Then I'm also going to commend the ARB for their excellent service.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Very nice. Nice lines.

MR. NEMECEK: It looks like it's consistent with some of the improvements that have been made in the neighborhood as well.
public hearing on Application 15-07, 7 Hunter Drive.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Charlotte, anything?

Nothing?

(No comments.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I make a motion to close the public hearing on Application 15-07, 7 Hunter Drive.
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MR. PULASKI: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else we need to talk about? Landscaping? Is there landscaping or a site plan showing that?

MR. IANNACITTO: The landscape is not required because this is an addition -- a landscape plan -- but we will be upgrading the landscaping on this.

MR. WEST: With the pool you don't need --

MR. IANNACITTO: You mean screening?

MR. WEST: Yes.

MR. IANNACITTO: Is that required?
MS. UHLE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a site plan?

MR. IANNACITO: This is the pool here, and this would be paved surface for a pool deck, and this is an existing patio. That's being reconfigured, which right from the lower level you could walk out here and then you walk out to a deck and then they'll be steps off the

deciduous area around the pool. We do have a 3 foot space between the property line and the paved area, and we will have some plantings there.

MR. NEMECEK: Tell me again, are you doing anything to alter the size of the driveway?

MR. IANNACITO: Right now the driveway is existing. We're not going to alter the driveway.

MR. NEMECEK: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm good. If there are no other comments, I make a motion to approve Application 15-07, 7 Hunter Drive.

MR. PULASKI: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Iannacito.

The next application is 15-09, 18 Interlaken.

MR. WILE: Hi. My name is Arnold Wile. I'm the architect for this project.

What we plan to do is to add an addition, as shown on this site plan. Something that's significant from a planning point of view is that this line -- you see this dotted line represents the current driveway, which takes a huge part of the site, but we're actually reducing the total covered area by eliminating so much driveway, and this addition only has a short driveway coming in to the front of the house.

This is the addition to the house, which is made of brick and slate roof, and we're matching the brick and we're matching the slate roof exactly. We're also matching all of the lines, and, architecturally speaking, we expect it to look like it was born there. I know that you have some photographs that we submitted, but I would like to show you this photograph, because what this does is it shows the relationship of 18 to its neighbors. As
y ou c an s ee, t hi s is t h e e x i s ti ng a n d t h e r e’ s
l o t s o f r o o m o v e r h e r e, a n d t h e r e’ s a c t u a l l y
l o t s o f r o o m h e r e t o o, a n d t h e a d d i t i o n i s
h e r e.

T H E C H A I R M A N : T h a t i s b r i l l i a n t .

D I N A M . M OR G A N , R E P O R T E R

T H A T ’ s r e a l l y g o o d. I d i d n ’ t m e a n t t o
i n t e r r u p t . C o n t i n u e .

M R . W I L E : T h a t ’ s i t .

T H E C H A I R M A N : O k a y .

M R . W I L E : I h a v e s o m e p a p e r s .

M R . N E M E C E K : A r e t h e r e g o i n g t o b e
a n y i s s u e s w i t h m a t c h i n g t h e b r i c k a n d t h e
s l a t e ?

M R . W I L E : N o. T h e b r i c k i s a c o m m o n
b r i c k , a n d t h e s l a t e i s j u s t a c o m m o n
P e n n a y l v a n i a s l a t e . V e r y e a s y t o m a t c h . I ’ v e
d o n e i t m a n y t i m e s .

M R . N E M E C E K : C a n I a s k : W h a t i s t h e
r e a s o n f o r t h i s a d d i t i o n ? I a s s u m e t h a t t h e
o w n e r w a n t s t h e m a s t e r b e d r o o m a n d t h a t ’ s t h e
m a i n r e a s o n f o r i t ?

M R . W I L E : Y e s. T h e f i r s t l e v e l w i l l
b e a g a r a g e a n d a b o v e t h a t t h e r e w i l l b e a
m a s t e r b e d r o o m .

M R . N E M E C E K : I t h i n k t h i s i s a
v e r y -- I k n o w t h i s h o u s e . I t ’ s a v e r y
beautiful house as is, and I certainly have a resistance to changing it, but I understand if there's -- my own personal opinion that this is a nice house doesn't stop progress. My concern is that you do everything you can to maintain the character of the house as it is, and it looks like you've certainly done your best to accomplish that.

MR. WILE: Everything is going to match exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we're just sort of stretching it in that direction for the most part. It's just going to be a larger, beautiful house.

MR. NEMECEK: The roof line is going to be straight, right, with the addition? You're not really going to notice where the old roof ends and the new roof begins?

MR. WILE: Exactly.

MR. NEMECEK: And the triangular portico up on the top there --

MR. WILE: This portico?

(Indicating.)

MR. NEMECEK: I'm sorry, the other -- I'm sorry, the gable in the middle, is that dead center on the new construction, or is that
MR. WILE: Is this dead center with respect to the entire roof?

MR. NEMECEK: It's close.

MR. WILE: No. It's slightly off.

We've also added -- there's a shed roof here right now, and we've added this part just to emphasize the -- but if you look at some of the photographs, you'll see that this is coming forward, so it works pretty well.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we're leaving the roof the same color as what's there; it's like a gray?

MR. WILE: It's gray.

THE COURT: The new will be the same gray; correct?

MR. WILE: Exactly. It's a standard Pennsylvania slate. There's no problem at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: The garage doors are going to be? The garage doors are going to be?

MR. WILE: We submitted a cut of the garage door. It's a colonial four by four panel door.

THE CHAIRMAN: White?

MR. WILE: Yes.
MR. NEMECEK: The existing driveway in the back, that's being -- it's being returned to lawn, the portion in the back that's not covered over by the addition?

MR. WILE: Well, what's happening here is that the -- if you look at the existing house, the existing house is actually a split level, and this part is being changed so that -- and it's very inconvenient to have a split level -- just a family room that's split level and that family room is being lowered to this level. So the house will be a standard colonial.

MR. NEMECEK: My question was, because earlier you pointed out that one of the interesting, from a planning perspective, features of this proposed addition is that you will reduce the amount of impervious surface on the property, and that's done because you're shortening the length of the driveway; right?

MR. WILE: Yes, we're eliminating it.

MR. NEMECEK: And you're eliminating the driveway in the back part of the house that's currently existing.
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MR. WILE: Yes. This backyard is taken up with a lot of pavement and that's going to be grass.

MR. NEMECEK: That's going to be restored to grass?

MR. WILE: Yes, exactly.

MR. NEMECEK: That's just a paved driveway, there's nothing underneath it?

MR. WILE: No, it's just a paved driveway. The pavement will be taken up and it will be grass.

MR. NEMECEK: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just have to do the public hearing, so standby. I just have to open the public hearing, so don't go anywhere. I make a motion to open the public hearing on Application 15-09, 18 Interlaken Drive.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

(No comments.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Make a motion to close the public hearing on the same application,
MR. PULASKI: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

MR. NEMECEK: I’ve asked my questions.

MR. PULASKI: Nothing.

MR. WEST: Nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any condensers or anything for air conditioning systems that you’re adding as a result of this?

MR. WILE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: No central air or anything being added or if it is it’s still there?

MR. WILE: I think they have central air now. That’s going to be extended.

THE CHAIRMAN: So what’s there stays?

So what’s there remains as is?

MR. WILE: The existing system will be expanded.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If there is a new condenser, it would be located -- if you’re expanding, it would seem like you would need to beef up the system a little bit. There’s an
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MR. WILE: There is someplace. Not on this side of the house. I think on the other side of house.

MR. NEMECEK: Is it anywhere on the site plan?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it's not.

MR. WILE: No, I don't see it.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you understand our concern, just that if there's a condenser that's in a new place, we would like to screen them with some sort of landscaping. Can we just make that a condition?

MS. ULE: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: If they move it or increase it in size or anything, just screen it with something to deaden the noise so the neighbors aren't complaining it. I don't think they have anything to complain about. It's very well done.

Nothing else being said, I'll make a motion to approve Application 15-09, 18 Interlaken, with the one condition previously stated.
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THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. NEMECEK: Thank you.

MR. WILE: Goodnight.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you're one of the only people that still drafts by hand. You still draft by hand. You're like the last one.

Next Application is 15-20, 102 White Road.

MR. JUNCAJ: Good evening. My name is Vasel Juncaj. I'm the owner of 102 White Road representing.

Last time we were here, we decided we wanted to do the HardiePlank on the house, and we kind of changed our mind, and we would like to go with a stucco instead. That was actually our original plan first, but then we changed and then changed it to original. Basically structurally everything stays the same as last time as we said. We have here stone on the first floor it's going to remain. This is existing. We're changing the second floor stucco, gable, side, also in the back. I have some photos. These are the photos of the previous house that was there. This is the progress of what we did. We have some photos of also some houses in the neighborhood in the screening.
surrounding neighborhood that we submitted already in the same block that have stucco already. We're basically going to keep the same stucco. This is the older house. I do have some samples here of what we would like to use there in terms of colors and design. Basically, it's straightforward, no quoins or anything, straight corners with fine finish stucco. The colors are going to be basically very neutral and a little touch on the molding around the windows, the one that I have here without the quoin on top.

MR. WEST: Are these houses on the same block as your house?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes. These are basically the colors and this is around the windows, the trim. The trim is going to be that lighter color.

MR. NEMECEK: You're not proposing to put quoins on the --

MR. JUNCAJ: No.

MR. NEMECEK: Okay. Good.

MR. JUNCAJ: That sample that I gave you over there for the trim that has a quoin on top, basically we would like to use that trim around the windows without the quoin.
042315PB.txt

THE CHAIRMAN: Got it.

MR. JUNCAJ: And all the corners, they're all going to be basically straight.

MR. NEMECEK: What was the impetus --

MR. JUNCAJ: Actually what we had before what we decided before last time we were here was something totally different. It was dark blue HardiePlanks.

MR. NEMECEK: What was the impetus for the change? Why are you before us? Is it just a change in opinion as to what's going to look nice; is it a cost issue; is it a little bit of both? You tell me.

MR. JUNCAJ: I don't know, because the HardiePlank that I wanted to use anyway basically was the same cost as what I'm going to be using right now with the stucco. I don't know if the cost was an issue. I'm a contractor myself, and I've seen a lot. Originally, I wanted the stucco, but then I kind of had a second opinion because of the way stucco gets and stuff like that, but then I came to that for me it's probably much easier to maintain than some other people because I'm in that type of business. That's why I decided to go back to stucco. I really like that.
Mediterranean look in combination with the stone that we had here last time that remains.

MR. NEMECEK: So it's principally aesthetic; you like it better?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes. Structurally nothing changes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: This is going to be a traditional stucco job, you're doing wire lath and stucco on top, or are you doing EIFS? Are you doing Styrofoam?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes, Styrofoam. Inch and a half Styrofoam and then stucco on top.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Is there a break at the center part right there?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes, it is. We kind of went like two inches farther out to have that nice match with the stone facade. We're going to be coming straight flush with that.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: So it's not going to be too tall?

MR. JUNCAJ: Right. Whether it was the stucco or what we had there before.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You got a control joint right there anyway. These are AZEK or that's going to be stucco trim too?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's going to be all painted.

MR. JUNCAJ: As you see in the picture, you can see actually the front, the top the flashing all is done by AZEK already.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Very nicely done there on top. Very nice.

MR. JUNCAJ: Thanks. All the changes are basically done on the principal of the look, aesthetic look.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know we have that one side elevation. The other side is? We have the one side elevation over there on the left-hand side. The other side is similar or what is the other side?

MR. JUNCAJ: It's basically the same except on the other side we have two bathroom windows and the garage windows, I'm sorry.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's going to be a full height wall of stucco?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes. But it's going to be separated with a little depth or something and not necessarily different colors just to continue that stone line.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's what I'm trying to understand, because that stucco wall is just
a big wall of stucco. You're saying it's being --

MR. JUNCAJ: It's going to be separated. As you see here in the picture here, right here in front where the stone stops we're going to continue on this side, make that a line, but it's going to be the same color, just a depth in the stucco. Nothing flashy with different colors.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it's going to be overhanging what's below; is that what you said, a step?

MR. JUNCAJ: No. This is going to be straight flush, but it's going to be a little insert here.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's a control joint there.

THE CHAIRMAN: How deep?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You can't do a full wall of stucco.

MR. JUNCAJ: It's going to be an inch or inch and a half deep, the size of the Styrofoam. We're going to cut that Styrofoam on an angle a little bit there just to break that wall.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's running around
the other side too?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes. Except on the other side we have two windows here, right here, and then first floor and then second floor.

(Indicating.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Do they line up, those windows?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes. All the windows line up. This door with the arch here lines up. Also, the windows in the back are all lining up.

MR. NEMECEK: Is this your home?

MR. JUNCAJ: Yes.

MR. NEMECEK: And you will be living in this home?

MR. JUNCAJ: Absolutely. Can't wait for it.

MR. NEMECEK: It looks uncluttered. I like that.

MR. JUNCAJ: Trying to keep that nice finished like neat, not necessarily clutter with a lot of quoins and clutter and stuff. I mean, everybody has an opinion, but --

THE CHAIRMAN: So all these windows on the elevation, the new front elevation, were on the previous elevation also; correct?
MR. JUNCAJ: Yes, correct.

MR. NEMECEK: It's been built so far exactly --

MR. JUNCAJ: It's going to remain like that. This is according to the plans and approvals that we had before, and we followed that, and it's remaining like that. We're not
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THE CHAIRMAN: Close the public hearing on the same application, 15-20, 102 White Road.

MR. PULASKI: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Guys, wake up. We're almost done. Let's go. All right. Good. So we think it's a handsome home. I like the stucco. As you said, you'll keep it clean. I understand the concern, but you just power wash it every so often. Are there trees nearby?

No.

MR. JUNCAJ: There's nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be beautiful.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You said you were doing the lighter color as the mass of it an the darker color was the trim or the opposite way around?

MR. JUNCAJ: Actually, the trim is going to be the lighter color.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did we approve this yet? So I make a motion to approve Application 15-20, 102 White Road.

MR. PULASKI: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.
THE CHAIRMAN: The last application is --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Is this where you are now at this point, this far along?

MR. NEMECEK: When you look at the prior, it's just amazing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Last application is 15-21, 7 D'Ambrosio Way.

MR. JUNCAJ: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're welcome. Have a good night.

MR. NEMECEK: While we have a break, I want to thank the town and the NFL for not scheduling the NFL draft on the same night as the Planning Board meeting and vice versa, for several years in a row.

MS. UHLE: As the applicant is setting up, can I give you just a quick little background on this?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MS. UHLE: I think Mr. Pulaski was the only one that was here at the time that the overall subdivision was approved. When the overall subdivision was approved, the applicant was contacted by the Planning Board. The Planning Board authorized Mr. Pulaski to go out and set up a meeting. Mr. Pulaski contacted the applicant and the applicant came out and met with the Planning Board. The Planning Board reviewed the application and the applicant was asked to come back and make any changes necessary. The Planning Board reviewed the applicant's changes and approved the application. The applicant was then asked to come back and make any final changes necessary. The Planning Board reviewed the final changes and approved the application.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're welcome. Have a good night.

MR. NEMECEK: While we have a break, I want to thank the town and the NFL for not scheduling the NFL draft on the same night as the Planning Board meeting and vice versa, for several years in a row.

MS. UHLE: As the applicant is setting up, can I give you just a quick little background on this?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MS. UHLE: I think Mr. Pulaski was the only one that was here at the time that the overall subdivision was approved. When the overall subdivision was approved, the applicant was contacted by the Planning Board. The Planning Board authorized Mr. Pulaski to go out and set up a meeting. Mr. Pulaski contacted the applicant and the applicant came out and met with the Planning Board. The Planning Board reviewed the application and the applicant was asked to come back and make any changes necessary. The Planning Board reviewed the applicant's changes and approved the application. The applicant was then asked to come back and make any final changes necessary. The Planning Board reviewed the final changes and approved the application.
subdivision was approved, it was approved as a
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cluster subdivision, which gave the Planning
Board some flexibility with regard to
establishing the front, side, and rear yards.
They did not have to be consistent with the
zoning. So in certain cases, the front yards
were less than what's required, in certain
cases they're greater than what's required. So
in the approved subdivision plat there was a
building envelope shown on each parcel.

On this Lot 4, if you see on this that
was given to you, the building envelope shown
on the subdivision plat actually ranged from 25
feet back to 45 feet back, and the house
technically was supposed to have been within
that building envelope. When the applicant
appeared before you recently and got approvals,
I think the architect misinterpreted that
between 25 to 45 feet to mean somewhere between
those two numbers, and so he showed a setback
of 30 feet. I did not pick that up myself in
the review of the application. Garrett did
pick up in looking at the design guidelines,
that he did mention that the garage extended
beyond the front of the house -- (inaudible) --
but this corner here that overlaps, that we were not explicit that technically it should have been set back that 45 feet.

That being said, what you approved was at 30 feet. The applicant got a -- and this is what kind of made us all aware of this -- had a surveyor out there staking out the foundation and discovered, first of all, that it wasn't back 45 feet, and then they also discovered that it's actually not back 30 feet. What's shown on this plan is it's set back 25.67 feet. But I think what the applicant is going to show to you, if you look at the other plan that was submitted to you, you can see that on the subdivision plat the setback for the three homes leading up to this home are all 20 feet, and then all of a sudden for the next two lots they're further back, and then across the road they range from 12 to 20 feet. So I think when the architect was placing the house, he placed it in a way that he felt was appropriate for the subdivision.

Anyway, they're here just to discuss that. I think what they would like to do is
convince you that it's appropriately located now, but that technically requires your approval.

MR. WEST: They matched it to where they built the other houses as opposed to --

MS. UHLE: To looking at that one building, the building envelope that's shown on this subdivision plan.

MR. ESPOSITO: If you look at the lay of the land, the house is kind of cut this way with the 25 foot setback on the curve, and followed the actual curve of the road. When you're driving up the road, you're going to actually see the front of the house. If it's cut back like this, you see the corner. Our engineer --

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you state your name for the record.

MR. ESPOSITO: Robert Esposito, 7 D'Ambrosio Way. When the engineer came up, he said, the house is 15, 20 feet off, you need to get a variance or you need to get the lines adjusted.

MS. UHLE: Actually, luckily for the
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applicant, a variance isn't required, because since it was approved as a cluster subdivision, this is a 20 foot setback, 12 foot setback, none of those comply with the underlying zoning. That was established by the Planning Board. So it's the Planning Board that can essentially make those adjustments, which is why they're here.

THE CHAIRMAN: So based on this plan here, if we were to make it the 45, it would be way, way, way back?

MR. ESPOSITO: When we originally came to the Planning Board, their intentions were to give us larger back yards. That's why all the front yards are 20 feet and across the street is 12. This way we bring the houses forward to leave a little more buffer in between the yards. If you look, it's 30 feet across the whole back, but if I tilt it like this, I go to 49 here.

MS. UHLE: Because they haven't started -- they don't even have a building permit for the house yet, but they were trying to lay out the foundation, etcetera, and I do
I believe, there is a potential buyer for the house already, and in order to fit stuff in the backyard they would kind of prefer to go with this orientation, if possible.

MR. ESPOSITO: This is the orientation of the house. This is how it was on the original plan. We're now going to tilt it this way a little bit. It's only the little triangle of the garage in that 45 feet.

MS. UHLE: Do you see where the overlap is on the plan there, what he's talking about?

MR. ESPOSITO: Right here. This right here.

(Indicating.)

MS. UHLE: Otherwise, everything is within the building envelope. It's just half of the garage there.

MR. ESPOSITO: Across the street is 12 feet, to the right of it is 20 for the house setback. Still even at 20 it's only a 30 foot backyard on the house to the left. This way at least you open it up and you get a little more green space.

MR. PULASKI: The house to the south, is that built?
MR. ESPOSITO: (Indicating.)

MR. PULASKI: No, no, not that one.

MR. ESPOSITO: That's not built yet.

MR. PULASKI: That's got a big setback.

THE CHAIRMAN: 40 foot 1.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You're saying in that illustration the house is actually turned more; right?

MR. ESPOSITO: This would be the 45 feet.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's what I'm saying, it's turned.

MR. ESPOSITO: Now it's cocked to the right. When you drive up, you're not going to just see the corner here, you're going to actually see the front of the house also.

MR. PULASKI: I see what you're saying, and I like it, but where my comment was starting to go was that if you look at the last house, that has quite a bit of setback, if the house we're talking about at this meeting were set back a little bit more than it is, it would start to become more humored as you enter that cul-de-sac. Otherwise, the house to the south of you just is going to look like it's on a
different property.

MS. UHLE: When they come before the Board, they may choose to move that one up a little further as well. It's shown --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's almost as if you're looking into the side of the house.

MR. ESPOSITO: This orientation of the house is so far set back.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: But the other house next to it is turned too. Basically your site lines are right into the garage of that house. It doesn't really flow.

MR. PULASKI: I don't think you could take that south house and pull it back up.

MS. UHLE: That shows a pretty big front driveway.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It gives the appearance like it's built behind it, from looking at it like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where that south house is shown, could you point it out?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's almost like the front of the house is almost behind the other house.

MS. UHLE: That's the driveway.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's the driveway.
THE CHAIRMAN: That's not the house.

MR. ESPOSITO: It's in the 40 and the 78.

MR. NEMECEK: So the 25.67 feet is the closest that it gets to the curb?

MR. ESPOSITO: It basically follows the same radius. Again, one of the reasons --

if we were to go to R-5 setbacks, we would have the room to move the house. The architect

found it very difficult to fit this size house in this shaped box. It wasn't until the engineer laid it out, that he finally said, you guys are off.

MS. UHLE: The architect didn't realize that he potentially had a problem, and we didn't pick up on it.
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MR. ESPOSITO: So before we built it, we said, let's come.

MR. NEMECEK: I seem to be hearing from this Board that our main concern is with the property to the south, because I think that's really about the only concern here.

MR. ESPOSITO: That house may not look like that. That's just a depiction of what it possibly could look like.

MS. UHLE: That was done as part of
the subdivision approval.

MR. ESPOSITO: It could be something totally different. So don't go by that house.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: But really there's not much you can do with it. You can't pull it all the way up to the front. I mean, it still looks like it's behind it, and it literally is behind it.

THE CHAIRMAN: This plan shows 40 feet, so you could pull it up to within 40 feet of the cul-de-sac and not have to come back here; right?

MR. ESPOSITO: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: So where would 40 feet be on that plan.

MR. ESPOSITO: On this plan?

(Indicating.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ESPOSITO: Right here. If you take this, they actually pretty much line up with the curve of the road.

MR. NEMECEK: As you're proposing to reorient it, you will actually have approximately the same orientation as the house to the south in that illustration that you have, which just has the building envelope.
MR. ESPOSITO: Right.

MR. NEMECEK: The way you're proposing to shift it, it actually would have the same orientation, right, more or less?

MR. ESPOSITO: I agree.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's pretty tight.

THE CHAIRMAN: I imagine when the south house goes up, you're going to be back here saying you don't want to make it 40 feet, you're going to want to put it closer?

MR. ESPOSITO: I don't know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Because if you don't, it's going to be hidden behind this house.

MR. ESPOSITO: As the aesthetic of the property, the road goes, I don't believe that it would look good set back that far any way. As you come around the circle --

MS. UHLE: Well, most people prefer a bigger back yard than a giant front yard.

MR. ESPOSITO: That was the intention of the Planning Board to do the cluster which relaxes the front yard setbacks, because I think R-5 is 25 minimum or 30?

MS. UHLE: 30 for the front yard.

MR. ESPOSITO: And none of them even match that.
THE CHAIRMAN: So I guess my question, Margaret, is: When the other Planning Board laid this out, it was more spacious at the end of the cul-de-sac? They had bigger setbacks for the final two homes and now we're sort of moving everything.

MS. UHLE: There are a couple of things. I'll be honest with you, when I was looking at this, I have no recollection of why those two particular lots with the advantage of setting them back further when the other ones were set back so much closer. I will say that there's a huge difference when you're dealing with conceptual blocks like that are shown on that subdivision map than when you're actually designing actual footprints and trying to fit them in. So I don't really know why those two lots are set back the way that they are compared to the other lots, especially since that sets them back closer to adjacent residences rather than closer to the internal part of the subdivision plat. I don't recall. I don't know if Mr. Pulaski recalls. Again, I think, too, some of it is trying to make the best decisions but you don't have actual building footprints to work with at that time.
MR. NEMECEK: I think the proposed orientation actually looks like it fits pretty nicely on this property if you're looking only on this property. Since the Lot 5 is at this point speculative --

MR. TUDISCO: It's really not before the Board.

MR. NEMECEK: Although --

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

MS. UHLE: You're trying to understand how it fits.

MR. NEMECEK: With this whole cluster concept.

THE CHAIRMAN: They're not separate applications.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: When you look at this plan, it looks like the other two houses have to be set back almost the same.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're saying that the approval of this is most likely going to shed some ideas on what you can do on the last one.

MR. ESPOSITO: We have no plans -- we have preliminary, but we're preliminary.

MR. PULASKI: Do you want to see what he's got for preliminary just to get a comparative view if something looks feasible? It's not to say that they're going to build it
that way, but it may be more thought perspective on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you're asking them to do some blocking for Lot 5?

MR. PULASKI: I thought you just said you had something.
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MR. ESPOSITO: It's very -- we don't even know what kind of house it's going to be yet.

MR. PULASKI: I think it's going to be a house where it's almost going to be like probably the DeBenedictis house where the front was a garage, very narrow.

MR. ESPOSITO: I don't think there are too many options. I believe we could get a three car garage on the approval of this house.

THE CHAIRMAN: This one or Lot 5?

(Indicating.)

MR. ESPOSITO: That's a 16,000 square foot lot.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you were to -- I know this is hypothetical -- which side would you put the three car garage on?

MR. ESPOSITO: Probably over here.

(Indicating.)

MR. PULASKI: That would be a lot of
façade that's garage door.

MR. ESPOSITO: (indicating.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, like that. Got you. So you're saying with that you would be

set back further because most of the house would be the garage, and then the body of house would be set back more?

MR. ESPOSITO: Yes.

MS. UHLE: Rob, do you know, the house on Lot 4 -- this isn't to scale, I don't think, the drawing that we have -- 7 D'Ambrosio Way, do you know how long it is?

MR. ESPOSITO: Over here?

(indicating.)

MS. UHLE: No, just the house itself. The width of the house.

MR. ESPOSITO: I believe it's 58 feet.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: So 58 and then you have 12, so it's about 82 feet across that line.

MR. PULASKI: The house I was referring to was on Tuckahoe.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We're trying to figure out how big the one next to it is. If this is 82 feet across there, at that same point --
MR. ESPOSITO: 58 feet 2 inches.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We're trying to figure out how wide it is on 5. Can you actually push the house up? If that house is 58 foot wide here and it's about 12 feet to the property line, right, so this one here seems to be a lot narrower, you would have to keep this house back behind it. So that's what's concerning us, because I've never seen it in this perspective before with the house that's on 4 is turned, is parallel to the road, it makes sense where you're putting it, but when you do that, you have to push the house on 5 back behind it, and it just seems peculiar when that house gets build that it will be behind the other house.

MS. UHLE: The only thing that I think is the house on Lot 5, the one that everyone is calling the southern just because it's the bottom, if you think of it -- I mean, honestly, it's only the corner of the garage that is extending beyond that setback. So to me the house on Lot 5 is -- the relationship of the house on Lot 5 is going to be pretty similar to the house on Lot 4 regardless of how you orient the house on Lot 4. Do you know what I'm
saying? The house on Lot 5 is going to be further back because of the configuration of the building envelope regardless of whether the house on Lot 4 is straight or slightly at an angle. To me the relationship is going to be the same regardless. Do you know what I'm saying?

MR. PULASKI: But I think it --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I think what you're saying is all the houses --

MR. PULASKI: What I wanted to say is --

MS. UHLE: That's regardless of what you do with the house on Lot 4.

MR. PULASKI: Even though the road makes a slight curve, the houses more or less line up.

THE CHAIRMAN: The front facade of the house lines up.

MS. UHLE: I think the front facades of the first four lots are going to line up the way that they're proposed now, and then the one in the back is always going to be in the back regardless of how you orient them just
because of that building envelope.

MR. PULASKI: Right, but the road starts to curve away from the front of the house, so that Lot 4 that house relative to the road appears further back even though it may align with the fronts of the other houses next to it. That's going to make the last house look a little bit more even.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless Rob does what he said, put a garage over here. Make this the garage over here.

(Indicator.)

MR. PULASKI: I think the other thing is that you're saying that the front of the houses align, but yet this house on Lot 4 has a rotation to it so that it parallels the road, the bend in the road, and I think that also helps to bring the house forward as opposed to the Lot 5. Lot 5 is funky. I've seen houses like this. To me, it comes from an old setup, maybe like a farmhouse setup where people were distant, and then they sold off the lots next to it and the houses next to it are closer.

MS. UHLE: Kind of like Highland
MR. ESPOSITO: The intention is to get a larger backyard. Not too many people play in the front yard. They put the swings, the kids in the backyard. If you see these two houses, 30 feet is not a lot of space for a backyard.

MR. WEST: We don't have too much of a problem on Lot 4, what you're doing on Lot 4 we like, but you're impacting Lot 5.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Absolutely, and they're not going to have any backyard.

MR. ESPOSITO: That's a large lot. That's a 16,000 square foot large.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The problem is it's narrow.

MR. ESPOSITO: Well, you can't change the shape.

MR. PULASKI: But you if you look at the DeBenedictis properties on Tuckahoe, they put up a very narrow house. They had a very deep lot. They put a pool in the back. They started off with a pair of garage doors and a narrow front entrance.

MS. UHLE: One option is now that
we're understanding this particular potential issue, when they come back for the house on Lot 5, just look at it in context more appropriately with the other houses. Be careful for Lot 5, and we'll all pay attention.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's just a lot easier to see it in that illustration.

MS. UHLE: Actually, when you come in for Lot 5, what I would do is actually show -- again, those were the conceptual just blocky things -- I would show Lots 2, 3, and 4 as they really are oriented when they're reviewing 5 and 6 and 7.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was my next question. I was going to ask about 2, 3, and 4 or 2 and 3; they're not done, are they? Have we seen them already, 2 3, and 4? 2 and 3 are on the same side of the street as 4?

MS. UHLE: Lots 2 and 3 are on the other side.

MR. ESPOSITO: These here? (Indicating.)

MS. UHLE: Those are done, correct.

MR. NEMECEK: Where are they relative...
MR. NEMECEK: Was it built basically in the same building envelope that's shown in here?

    (Indicating.)

MR. ESPOSITO: Yes. These I think have a 20 foot setback.

MS. UHLE: Again, that's not an accurate depiction of the footprint. That looks a lot clunkier because it's just the conceptual.

MR. NEMECEK: It probably would have helped if you came today with an accurate footprint of 3 in particular for future reference.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does 3 turn to sort of parallel the road?

MR. ESPOSITO: 3 turns -- I believe they seem to visually follow the curve of the road. That's why when we got to 7 if you're standing there you're looking almost through the circle instead of following the curve of the circle.
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wider portion is going to be the depth.

       MS. UHLE: When you're done with part
of the discussion, I have one other thing to
bring up.

       THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

       MS. UHLE: I know you and your
brother-in-law are living in a couple of the
houses; right?

       MR. ESPOSITO: Yes. We live here
right now currently. He is going to move out
and live here.

       (Indicating.)

       MS. UHLE: The others have been sold
already; right?

       MR. ESPOSITO: Yes. This one is up
for sale. Anyone looking for a house?

       MS. UHLE: The other thing I was going
to mention is this came to light I think some
time last week or so, and the applicant was
trying to see if maybe they could resolve the
outside of the cul-de-sac. In order to have something before the Board that's not a public hearing, you have to vote, if the law does allow you to hear applications that are not public hearings. If you feel comfortable with that. If you don't, I mentioned to the applicant that you could say come back as part of a public hearing. I at least wanted allow them to -- I think I met with the applicant on Monday, and then they submitted these materials to us on Wednesday, and I said, well, come, we'll add you to the agenda as a discussion item, if the Board feels comfortable with it, it is about the rotation of the house slightly, then you could just move it along. Again, that's your decision in terms of your comfort level.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we are
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comfortable evaluating this on our own. As we've all said, my only concern is the other lot.

MR. NEMECEK: Yes, and since there is nobody really who's going to -- there's no home owner for Lot 5 who's going to show up at a public hearing and complain --

MS. UHLE: That's the only -- I do
think you sort of made it clear to the applicant when they come in with Lot 5, that you're going to really want to see that in context with the other lots. Hopefully they have a creative architect that can come up with something that looks like --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That makes it all flow. That's really what we're all looking for.

MR. NEMECEK: I'll warn you: You're the builders here, you're asking us to permit you to change the orientation on 4, just be careful, you know, that you're very prepared on 5, because you don't want to have completely screwed up 5 just to help 4. You know, it's in your interest to do that, and I'm sure you're well aware of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you could go and build 5 per the setbacks on this map and not have to come back here; correct?

MS. UHLE: They have to come back for the site plan approval anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it abides by the guidelines of these setbacks --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You --

MS. UHLE: Yes, you could.
THE CHAIRMAN: Because it's not a zoning thing.

MS. UHLE: I do trust that they -- I think that they have done really good quality homes so far, and I think they're not only looking at quality materials, etcetera, that they have been careful on how they're siting them actually, even though this was kind of a mistake on a bunch of our parts. I do think they will -- I'm sure that they're going to try to site the one on Lot 5 in a way that is reasonable and makes sense. You could tell them it should be a little forward or a little more back.
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MR. CUNNINGHAM: To me it just seems like it's in your best interest that it all lays out properly.

MR. NEMECEK: And you live on the street. So you don't have a very ornery person you just sold 5 to.

THE CHAIRMAN: My concern is that you drive down the street, you pass all the houses, you get to the end and you don't see anything, it's a big void of open space.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's like, what happened to that one.
THE CHAIRMAN: Right. But as Margaret pointed out, we'll say, move it so it's more visible at that point.

MR. NEMECEK: I kind of like these cluster developments, because it sounds like we have much more leeway.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. We don't have to go to zoning.

MR. NEMECEK: It's like a star chamber.

THE CHAIRMAN: So then what's the correct protocol here?

MS. UHLE: I would just make a motion to waive the requirement for a public hearing and then --

THE CHAIRMAN: Make a motion to approve the change in setback?

MS. UHLE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So then I make a motion to waive the public hearing for the application in front of us, 15-21, 7 D'Ambrosio Way.

MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Then I make a motion to approve the change in setback for Lot 4 from....
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that depicted on the site plan to the 25
proposed by the applicant.

MR. NEMECEK: 25.67.


MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

MR. ESPOSITO: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're good. Thank you.
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So then we're done here. The only other thing is minutes.

MR. NEMECEK: I reviewed the minutes and I have no changes.

MS. UHLE: Are you serious?

THE CHAIRMAN: There was one punctuation thing, but he looked at me on the train and said, I'll just let that slide. He said, that would be best, right.

MR. NEMECEK: It was a singular as opposed to a plural and really you could not detect it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who was here? It's all of us; one, two, three, four. That was a full board as well. So then I make a motion to approve the minutes of March 26, 2015.
MR. NEMECEK: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I make a motion to close the Town of Eastchester Planning Board meeting of today, April 23rd.
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