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 revisions to Margaret to the transcript of the
 April 23, 2015 meeting. Does anyone else have
 any comments?

 MR. PULASKI: 1 objected to none of
 those revisions.

 ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: All right.

 I will then move to approve the minutes of the
 April 23, 2015 Eastchester Planning Board
 meeting subject to those three revisions being
 made.

 MR. PULASKI: Second.

 ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: All in
 favor.

 (Aye.)

 ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: We have five
 items on tonight's schedule. The first item is
 a matter of old business, Application 14-59,
 which is 233 Main Street. It is a continuation
 of a public hearing. Than we have four items
 of new business, and we're going to do them in
 just a slightly different order than they
 appear on the agenda. The second item will be
 1 Corwood Road. That will come after 233 Main
 Street. That is Application 15-17, 1 Corwood

 DINIA M. MORANG, REPORTER
located at this property, but after reviewing it with contractors and determining that the structure was not capable of supporting the second story, it would be better to just start from the foundation up. We’re going to try to preserve the existing portion of the foundation that has an existing basement, but we will evaluate that at some point and then decide whether we have to put a whole new foundation in also.

So the existing property is currently non-conforming with respect to both side yards -- both side yard setbacks and the total number of off-street parking spaces. The existing structure is currently used for personal service on the first floor and two dwelling units; one located on the first floor and the second on the second floor.

The scope of work will include expanding the personal service to occupy the entire first floor, and then relocating the dwelling units up onto the second floor.

I’ll show you the existing plan here first. Here we have the existing first floor
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plan, which shows the existing personal service space at the front of the building, and then one dwelling unit, a studio apartment, at the rear, and then the second floor has the second studio apartment, and these are the front and rear elevations of the existing structure as it is today.

On the proposed plans, the first floor will be used completely for the personal service unit, which will be a new hair salon, a waiting reception area, cutting area, washing stations, and handicapped bathroom. The hair salon will be accessible from Main Street, and the apartments will be accessible through a side entrance up a staircase to the two studio dwelling units on the second floor.

On the exterior, we’re proposing a stucco finish with arched storefront glazing at the base of the building with balconies with metal railings up at the second story for the dwelling unit. The proposed exterior materials, the wall surfaces will be a three coat stucco in a classic cream finish, the windows will be vinyl clad in a white finish,
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that I submitted to the Board, which was given to me by the owner of the hair salon as what they wanted the hair salon to look like. And then the third comment was to provide planters along the front underneath the large arched window, which we have shown on the site plan.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Are the planters permanent fixtures?

MR. IANNACITO: Well, they're not going to be nailed down to the ground. They'll just be planters that are placed in front of the --

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Tell me a little bit about the chronology as to what happened between the time you were before us in early December and the time you were before the Zoning Board in early February; February 10th was that the date?

MR. IANNACITO: Yeah. We went December, then January there was no -- there was a December meeting for the Zoning Board. It was a special meeting. They weren't suppose to meet that December.

THE COURT: What I'm getting at,
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though, the Zoning Board, did they see this plan, or did this plan emerge after the Zoning Board meeting?

MR. IANNACITO: They did not see this plan. They approved the plan that was going to be additions to the existing, which was going to require more variances than this plan.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: You mentioned the reduction in the variance by virtue of moving the building back and adding the planters.

MR. IANNACITO: Yes. And also, one side yard went from zero to 3 and a half feet.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Did the Zoning Board approve the variances as originally requested?

MR. IANNACITO: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: So you've reduced the variances since the time you received the approval of the Zoning Board?

MR. IANNACITO: Right. Correct.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: There were no additional variances required by the revisions that you made to the plan; right?
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1 well know from your very fine building that you
2 put up on White Plains Road and have your
3 offices in, is parking, and you mentioned that
4 there was -- that this property was
5 non-conforming insofar as it lacked the six
6 spaces that it would have needed previously,
7 and now I guess because you're adding a second
8 floor --
9 MR. IANNACITO: I think it's really
10 just the expansion of the personal service,
11 because the --
12 ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Okay.
13 That's right. Because of the nature of the
14 business now, the requirement is for 12 spaces.
15 MR. IANNACITO: 12 spaces based on
16 that square footage.
17 ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Again,
18 although you've answered this question, I do
19 want to make sure this is the case, that the
20 Zoning Board examined your request for a
21 variance as to parking where the requirement
22 was 12?
23 MR. IANNACITO: Yes.
24 MS. UHLE: Yes. That has not changed.
25 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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2 If that had increased, they would definitely
3 have to go back. I understand perfectly Mr.
4 Pulaski's question, and I think one kind of
5 difference, if you look at the site plan here,
6 even though it has been described as additions
7 and alterations, it's so significant in the
8 sense that they're building a whole new front
9 of the building. Sometimes you would think the
10 reason the Zoning Board granted the variances
11 is because you're constrained by the footprints
12 of the existing building, but they were always
13 kind of working beyond that under any
14 circumstance.
15 MR. IANNACITO: And in the initial
16 presentation, the second floor was coming off
17 either way.
18 MR. PULASKI: My concern has less to
d0 do with this particular project, because I
20 recognize that you are not going higher and
21 that you did take the expansion of the
22 footprint to the Zoning Board and the Zoning
23 Board approved it and they're fine with the
24 parking issue, but another person coming and
25 saying, well, you did it on this project and we
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2 now want to do it over here, but they are,
3 let's say, going an additional -- so I want to
4 make sure we are not negating any of the
5 requirements.
6 MS. UHLE: I absolutely understand. I
7 will let you know, we have often sent people
8 back to the Zoning Board for those very
9 reasons. If they had increased any of the
10 setbacks, had increased the requirement for
11 parking, had made significant changes to the
12 overall building footprint, they would have
13 gone back.
14 MR. PULASKI: I remember years ago
15 there was a situation like that. But I like
16 it. It's very nice. I liked it before, and
17 now I like it again.
18 ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: We still
19 have open a public hearing; right?
20 MS. UHLE: Yes.
21 ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Anyone have
22 any further questions on the Board for Mr.
23 Iannacito?
24 MR. CUNNINGHAM: No.
25 ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: All right.
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ACTING CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

(All aye.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Now -- I had previously gotten ahead of myself -- I make a motion to approve Application 14-59, 233 Main Street.

MR. PULASKI: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: All in favor.

(All aye.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Good luck.

MR. IANNACITO: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Congratulations.

Next up, as I indicated earlier, we're going slightly out of order here, we're going to go with Application 15-79, which is 19 Corwood Road. We're ready when you are.

MR. FINELLI: Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chairman, member of the Board.

Gennaro Michael Finelli, I'm the architect for the project. I'm actually here tonight with the owners of the property and the builders, Luigi Junior and Senior Rogliano of RCC.
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Construction. Our engineer could not make it this evening, so I'm going to try to field as many questions about the engineering drawing as I possibly can.

We are proposing a single family residence around 4,900 square feet. It's going to be constructed on the corner of Corwood Road and California Road. There's currently an empty lot. The property on this site slopes from front to back about 10 feet or so. We had a lot of concerns from the neighbor on California Road. We actually set up a site walk with the neighbor. The builders were out there, I think Jay King was out there as well, the site engineer, and they went over solutions and I guess suggestions on how they were going to fix and mitigate the drainage issue and the water runoff issue. I believe Mr. Alan Pilch also reviewed those plans and approved most of what you see here tonight. I think I did hear that there might be one or two more comments that we'll try to address when the time comes, but as far as the -- I'll go into the architecture first and then we'll come back.
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color scheme that we are proposing. Again, as I said, we took our cues from the house next door. As you continue up Corwood Road, there are two colonials which sit -- well, directly adjacent to us is a modern split level home. The next house is a colonial home. So we tried to blend in a lot of architecture from the neighborhood, and we came up with this. We like it, and the Architectural Review Board liked it as well.

Again, as I said, the home is 4,900 square feet. As far as setbacks go, it conforms in every way. We actually have our landscape architect here with us as well, Tony A cocella, and he will go in a few minutes into our landscaping and dressing up the architecture even further with some landscaping.

Just to, I guess, maybe delve into the site engineer's work a little bit, he proposed to put CULTEC chambers in the front of the property since it does slope to the back, and this, I guess, directly affects the architecture, because we're building up now the DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

back of the property. We're going to introduce two retaining walls across the back property. The site is going to be regraded. We're going to install a -- we actually have it drawn out, it's a vegetated channel, and the hope is that although the property is going to be raised, it will slope slightly towards those walls, and those walls will be 6 inches taller than the grading at the back of the house. So it will catch any water that might slip past and go towards that property, get collected in this vegetated channel, and then get filtered out naturally. The landscaping addresses that as well even further. So I might defer that to the landscape architect in a few minutes.

Just to go through the material selection just to let you know what we're doing. We're putting Andersen windows in, six over -- divided lights -- I can't say six over six, because there are some places where it's actually eight over eight just because of the size of the window. We are going to have a gray colored stucco. Actually, I have the exact colors. The stucco is going to be a DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

beige, I'm sorry, not gray. We're doing a Salem Creek Tudor, which is like a reddish brick. I have a sample of that as well. I'm sorry, I lost one of my samples on the way in here. The brick will actually pull out the gray -- the cream rather in the gable ends. All the timbering will be AZEK, it will be white. Any railings that we do will be black wrought iron. We're doing the charcoal roof, again unless you want a lighter roof. Gray mortar between the bricks. That's pretty much all I have for the front of the house. We're going to stain the front door a mahogany stain. The garage doors will be white. Yeah, that's pretty much all I have for the architecture.

If you would like to speak to Mr. Tony Acocella, and he could maybe walk you through the landscape plan. Unless you have any questions directly, I'm happy to answer them.

MS. UHLE: You keep referencing the two different options for the shingles.

MR. FINELLI: The stucco. I'm sorry --

MS. UHLE: The roof. The shingles.

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

What are the two -- you said you proposed one and the ARB had recommended a lighter shade.

MR. FINELLI: We proposed this color here, which is a charcoal, but they were -- I guess the bigger sample one. So they want to do more of a lighter color rather than a dark.

MS. UHLE: So you said you will do that?

MR. FINELLI: We're willing to do.

They didn't go on the record as saying that we had to do it, it was just a suggestion.

MS. UHLE: That's what I thought.

MR. FINELLI: So beyond that, I guess I'll defer to Mr. Tony Acocella and have him talk about this a little bit.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Does your client have a strong preference as to recognizing that they will accede to the wishes of this Board and/or the ARB, does the owner have a strong preference as to the roof color?

MR. FINELLI: No. I mean --

MR. ROGLIANO: The color --

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Come up, please, and identify yourself.

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
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MS. UHLE: I just want to clarify the reason I asked the question is because I did not have that in my own notes for the meeting that it was a requirement of the ARB. Michael was clarifying that it was a suggestion. I didn't know whether I missed something.

MR. ROGLIANO: My name is Luigi Rogliano. I'm the property owner or proposed property owner. We don't have a preference. I mean, charcoal, black. The color scheme of the house is pretty simple. It's gray, reddish sanded brick. So whether it's a black charcoal or lighter charcoal, I have no preference.

MR. ACOCELLA: Good evening, members of the Board and Mrs. Uhle. My name is Tony Acocella, and I'm a landscape architect working on this project. One of the initial --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Excuse me, could you just turn that microphone toward you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: We have a substantial viewing audience at home, and they want to capture every word you say.

MR. ACOCELLA: One of the major issues that I recognized coming onto the site the
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first time is the development of the borders of this property for privacy for the new homeowners as well as the neighbor to the rear, and to solve that I've detailed a Arborvitae planting along that rear property and side property. The rear property is for the privacy between the new homeowners and the existing. Coming up California Road would be the privacy that would be desired by the new homeowner. In the far right-hand corner on the existing property to the right there is an existing planting of Spruce trees. What I've done is instead of making the Arborvitae just go straight across the back, in that one corner I'll be planting some more Spruce trees to compliment the existing ones. So there will be a change of material for more visual interest. There are two trees that are put there in the rear also. They are red Maples. Those will get taller initially than any of the evergreens, and they will actually, from the second floor of the new building, give a -- I don't want to say an interference -- they will screen you somewhat from the properties to the
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far right, and again, looking down California Road and any potential view down onto the parkway. In the front of the property, if I could just step over here one moment -- am I allowed to do that?

MS. UHLE: You can bring the microphone with you.

MR. ACOCELLA: Here we go. If you just focus on this area, this is the garage, the side which is facing Corwood Road, and I just want to flick back to this elevation. That's this area, which doesn't have the visual interest, you know, of the window patterns on the main entrance of the house. This is, we'll use the word "attractive." If you're driving by and you look at that, there's a certain visual interest to that. This is, you know, of less interest --

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: Dull.

MR. ACOCELLA: -- and that's why at this point I'm proposing to put several Dogwoods here. Those Dogwoods also scale and integrate that wing of the building which
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doesn't have the same visual interest as the main entrance of the courtyard entrance. Then in the rear here also there is an area of this building which has very little windows, and there I'm proposing two minor trees. They're called Chaprows (Ph.), which, again, if you look at the building there will be some visual relief along that side.

Along the very front of the building, it's going to be a very, very low planting in front of these windows of Boxwoods. It will just be a small band and this way the vegetation will not get up and intercept the window. So it will just be a low band of Boxwoods in the front. To date, that is the planting plans development. Are there any questions?

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: Are there existing trees on this property that will remain on the property?

MR. ACOCELLA: I think there are existing trees where I point here. There is a 48 inch oak tree, I believe, and there's a 14 inch Maple tree here. The remainder of the
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trees, due to the positioning of the building and the driveway, are going to be removed.
There are some other trees, but with the amount of grading and maneuvering required for that accomplishment, the existing trees will be removed.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECKE: So basically the entire back yard or the back upper left corner is going to be regraded; right?
MR. ACOCELLA: Correct. The entire yard will be regraded. The core of the trees that are existing right in the middle of the yard now will obviously be gone because of the positioning of the structure.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECKE: Tell me a little bit more about the plantings in the upper right.

MR. ACOCELLA: Up here? (Indicating.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECKE: Yes. Those are new plantings?

MR. ACOCELLA: Yes, these will be all new plantings. These will be the West Coast Arborvitae or Joint Arborvitae as some people call them. Again, that is to give visual relief for the new dwelling as well as the existing. As we go past the direct window contact -- this way to this way, this way to this way -- in this corner on this property there exists a very nice planting of Spruce trees, and to add a -- to make this more important, I'm going to be adding more Spruce trees, the same variety as this, so that in this corner there will be a strong composition of Spruce trees and we won't have a complete enclosure of Arborvitae.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECKE: Good. It looks like a little grove of Spruce trees then.

MS. UHLE: I have a couple of questions.

Mr. Acocella, on the engineering plans it shows in front of the retaining wall where you have the Arborvitae proposed it says "vegetated channel," so I had assumed that was going to be a swale with grasses and that type of thing; is there going to be another swale or vegetated channel in front of the Arborvitae or are the Arborvitae considered to be that
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MR. ROGLIANO: Yeah, 83.5. What we’re proposing in discussions with the homeowner is putting some type of drainage pipe to ensure that any water that would overflow is caught.

You know what I’m saying? If you see, like you said, there’s extensive trees along the back and rear of the property, because we are taking out an extensive amount of trees due to the location of the house.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: What I’m not understanding, perhaps because I don’t speak your language, Margaret, this vegetated channel, that is going to be at 83.5 and that is going to be the wall of Arborvitae?

MR. ROGLIANO: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: Any berms at all?

MR. ROGLIANO: Well, it’s not going to be a berm, it’s going to be level, but right before the trees on our side there will be a slight swale coming up, because there is a 6 inch difference in order to make the backyard level.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: Correct, but
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the top of the wall, the retaining wall, is 86.5, so the trees will actually be --

MR. ROGLIANO: 86.5.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: At 86.5 or 83?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Wait a minute. You just said two different things. The bottom of the wall is 83.5, which is grade.

MR. ROGLIANO: Uh-huh.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay. So that is where the Arborvitae is going to be planted, unless it’s a berm.

MR. ROGLIANO: Say that again. I’m sorry.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You said the bottom of the wall is 83.5, the top of the wall is 86.5, so it’s a 3 foot difference. So give me grade. Give me grade. Is grade bottom of the wall?

MR. ROGLIANO: The existing grade of the backyard?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

MR. ROGLIANO: Yes, it’s 86.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You’re telling me
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walls, but I don’t know what grade is.

MR. ROGLIANO: Oh, grade is 86.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay. So 5 inches from the top of the wall is grade?

MR. ROGLIANO: Yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: So that’s why it’s built up.

MR. ROGLIANO: Sorry, I misunderstood the question.

MS. UHLE: I think kind of related, and this may be more of a question for you or Michael, is that, again, I’m a little confused with how these walls are working. It might be good if you could give us a cross section through there or something, but I’m especially confused about how the lower retaining wall adjacent to the resident 561 is -- how is that integrated with the existing fieldstone wall, because on the engineer plans and on the landscape plans it looks like they’re right on top of each other?

MR. ROGLIANO: If you go out on site, that is not really an existing stone wall.

It’s more of rocks laid along the ground.
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EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 5/28/15

MS. UHLE: Kind of more rubble.

MR. ROGLIANO: It’s more things that were dumped to, I guess, stop the flow of wall.

MS. UHLE: You’re going to have to deal with that somehow; right?

MR. ROGLIANO: Our wall is going to be placed behind that essentially. I mean, I know it looks like it’s on top of it, but this rubble wall or these so called laid stones are a little farther in than actually indicates here.

MS. UHLE: So that existing fieldstone wall or those existing fieldstones -- maybe not really a wall -- you’re going to set your first proposed wall behind that?

MR. ROGLIANO: Yes.

MS. UHLE: You’re not going to disturb those stones at all?

MR. ROGLIANO: No. We’re going to set is behind those.

MS. UHLE: I know there’s an existing chain link fence on your property; that you’re going to take out completely?

MR. ROGLIANO: Yes. I mean, once we
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get there and we see where it positions, you
know, it's something that, you know, is
collaboration with the neighbors.

MS. UHLE: You'll try to work with
them?

MR. ROGLIANO: We'll work with them.

If they want it removed, you know -- we have a
large property. It's not like we're tight for
space, so if it's 6 inches one way, 6 inches
another, a foot one way, as long as it's on our
property we have no issue with moving the wall
to accommodate the neighbors.

MS. UHLE: Okay.

MR. PULASKI: I want to ask you a
question about elevation sheet A-5, and I want
to ask it with respect to what you're doing
with the landscaping. So I'm looking at the
bottom elevation and to my right that -- the
other side -- this side -- that's the back of
the garage. On your landscaping plan you said
that was kind of a dull elevation, you were
adding a lot of --

MR. ACOCELLA: This is where the trees
are placed.
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of the brick, but as soon as you made that
turn, it did.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECK: So do we
have any questions about the structure itself?

MR. PULASKI: How about Alan Pilch?

MR. BONANNO: We looked at the
elevations of the house? The color renderings
and everything?

MS. UHLE: He went over that.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECK: Do you want
to see the materials?

MR. BONANNO: You guys have seen them
already? I trust your judgment.

MR. FINELLI: I'm happy to show them
again.

MR. BONANNO: I need to see them.

MR. FINELLI: The roof we proposed
charcoal. The ARB asked us kind of on the side
off the record if we wanted to lighten it up.

So we were thinking more of a lighter -- going
more with a gray rather than that darker
charcoal color. The owners are okay with going
with a little bit of a lighter color, so that's
not an issue for us.
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MR. PULASKI: That's where I was
hoping they were, but what's going behind the
garage?

MR. FINELLI: Behind the garage are
these plantings here.

MR. PULASKI: Okay. All right. So
the trees are going -- that's fine, because
that elevation does need those trees. Yeah.

All right. That was my concern. When you get
a lot of flat, smooth brick, it gets
overwhelming. The trees will break it up.

MR. FINELLI: We actually had windows
planned there at one time, but because of the
kitchen layout and decisions made beyond my
control and design as per the owner, we ended
up with a situation like that. We figured it
was a good place to let the landscape architect
loose and see what he comes up with.

MR. PULASKI: It's a good way to
handle that.

MR. FINELLI: Yeah, Tony does a good
job.

MR. PULASKI: The front has a lot of
business to it, your eye doesn't catch all of

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
EASTCHESTER PLANNING BOARD - 5/28/15

know, the ARB was please with the overall aesthetics of the house and the landscape architect just presented the landscape plan. I do think we had quite a few outstanding comments with regard to the storm water management plan, so that Alan can address.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: For the record, Chairman James Bonanno did enter the meeting relatively early in this application.

MR. PULASKI: If you guys want to do an arm wrestle, I'll move.

MR. BONANNO: I can abstain from this one since I didn't hear the whole thing. So let's just carry on.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECZEK: Let's hear from Alan Pilch.

MR. PILCH: Good evening. Alan Pilch, Evans Associates, licensed professional engineer.

So I reviewed actually what was a prior plan that was produced by Mr. McGarvey. This one I do know provides a few spot elevations around the perimeter of it. It is something that I did request a few weeks ago.
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Unfortunately, I hadn't seen this one. What I had noted previously was that the 15 chambers that Mr. McGarvey provided do have the capacity to attenuate the 50 year storm event. So in that sense design it can meet the town's code.

I did ask at that time that the applicant's engineer provide spot grades around the building, which he did here, as well as grades on the property itself, and I don't see those on these plans. I think there really should be a grading plan. I think it would help answer some of the questions that Margaret Uhle also had with regard to the interaction of the retaining walls with the existing wall and how the vegetated channel works through it as well.

I do believe showing a section through there would be helpful, and even looking at these spot grades, I'm not necessarily convinced I know how the flow would get to the back corners of the house into these chambers adequately, that there would be sufficient pitch on the storm drainage pipes, which are shown around the perimeter of the house here and around the perimeter of the house here, how it gets from...
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these locations to the chambers there. That's one of the questions that I still have on this plan.

Lastly, one of the questions too was with this vegetated channel and its location, there's two lines of retaining walls shown on the plan. I guess one of the questions that I think a more detailed grading plan would show, a proposed grading plan would show was, what happens to that flow when it reaches that corner of the property, the low end if you will. Does it flow -- the natural drainage pattern right now is to flow toward, let's say, I guess that's south actually and then toward California Road. There's actually and existing small drain here which will be removed, and this is like a 4 inch drain. It's probably clogged or whatever. It discharges adjacent to the street. What happens at this corner where the two walls are present; how does the flow go from that point without going on the neighbor's property; how is it transitioned from that point to California Road, which it normally goes to? Those are some of the questions that,
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to my way of thinking, still remain on this.

MR. PULASKI: I agree. I think it helps the builder, the homeowner, the town, the excavator and landscaper to have it laid out, and we know that it's going to work, and then it's just a matter of the installers holding to those lines.

MR. PILCH: Right.

MR. PULASKI: If we don't have it mapped out, then somebody's going to just wave their hands and who knows what we're going to end up with, and if we have a disagreement after we're all done, we aren't going to have a leg to stand out, and the owner won't have a proper leg to stand on either. I definitely support getting some good drainage contour plans.

MS. UHLE: One thing that I had requested from the engineer as well is Mr. Pilch had written a memo dated May 8, 2015, and I think whenever we have our consultants write a memo, we need some kind of written response so that we know what's been responded to, what hasn't been responded to, if there's...
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outstanding issues, if there's disagreement,
and I don't believe there is any further
correspondence after that.

MR. PILCH: The only thing Mr.
McGarvey did provide, he did update -- his
original calculations were for a 25 year storm,
and he did update it for a 50 year storm, and
he sent that along.

MS. UHLE: He sent that to you.

Again, there is no indication to the Planning
Board that had been addressed. That's why
when I started reviewing this last week, I
started getting confused because I saw these
comments, but I wasn't sure whether they had
actually been responded to or not.

MR. PILCH: They had not been
directly, that's correct.

MR. BONANNO: Your comments, some of
them are here in your memo, one about the storm
and about the elevation of the perimeter drains
making it to the CULTEC's. The one about that
corner on the south side, that's new?

MR. PILCH: Correct, that is new. I
mean, it doesn't pertain particularly to
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whether or not the code is -- the 50 year storm
is attenuated. That's really the neighbor
issue. You're correct, that's really a design
issue that would be evident once there was a
grading plan, but there isn't. One of the
reasons I requested that was to have a proposed
grading plan.

MR. BONANNO: Right. The way it's
drawn now, that water just goes to that corner
and sits, right, it's got no place to go?

MR. PILCH: We don't know.

MR. PULASKI: It's a difficult site,
and the owner of the property needs to be
guaranteed that the system is going to drain
right.

MR. PILCH: Right. I mean, the two
walls being proposed certainly have a potential
to stop the flow from going onto the neighbor's
property, but I just don't think the
information on the overall plan is --

MS. UHLE: I think the applicant and
the applicant's engineer are very willing and
have expressed that they plan and intend to
address these issues. I think it's just a
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matter of the engineer providing much more
detail on the plans. It's in his head right
now, but they need to put it on the plans. I
think they're all things, as far as I
understand, can be fairly readily addressed,
they just need to be detailed out.

MR. PULASKI: Right. The 50 year
storm is just a matter of redoing the
calculations. Alan has figured that the dry
wells are big enough.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: You said
that the calculations have been resubmitted to
you but just not to the Board; right?

MS. UHLE: That's correct.

MR. PILCH: That's correct. I did see
the calculations, and it would -- 15 chambers
does have the capacity to attenuate the 50 year
storm, the increase in flows. Again, my
concern was: How is it conveyed to it? How
does it get there the way it's supposed to?

MR. BONANNO: Those chambers could be
dropped a foot or two to get the slope you need
from the perimeter drains?

MR. PILCH: If need be. That's
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getting pretty deep, that's one of the
concerns. Mr. McGarvey did do percolation deep
hole tests. I was able to observe the deep
hole test, and I saw what the soil was like,
and they were reasonable soils with respect to
an infiltration system.

MR. PULASKI: With due respect, the
architect said at the start that the engineer
wasn't able to make the meeting. So he's
punting.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Any further
issues that you would observe by virtue of the
regrading of the backyard, the proposed
regrading?

MR. PILCH: No.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Because
you've done the perc test; right?

MR. PILCH: Right. That's correct.

MS. UHLE: I don't want to repeat
myself, but I'm going to to an extent. One
other issue. This issue with the concerns that
the immediate adjacent neighbors have, I think,
and I think the applicant would agree and our
engineers would agree, they've been very
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reasonable in their concerns and requests and
they're not at all trying to take advantage.
The one thing that I had also asked the
engineer do is just explain to us what the
neighbor's concern is and how they're
addressing it, just also so that the neighbors
could understand it. Again, they're not asking
for anything unreasonable. It's not something
that's costly for the applicant. It's a matter
of some fine grading, putting the walls in. I
think that would be helpful if those issues
could just be more clarified.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: So any
further comments?

(No comments.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: It seems to
me that this Board has expressed some concern
that we want to tie up some loose ends.
MS. UHLE: We also have the public
hearing.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Yeah, I know
that.

MS. UHLE: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: So with that
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said, since we have a sizable audience here, we
may have someone to comment on this, I move to
open the public hearing on Application 15-17, 1
Corwood Road.

MR. PULASKI: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: All in
favor.

(All aye.)

MS. DUBAK: Good evening.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: If you could
identify yourself and your address.

MS. DUBAK: Good evening. My name is
Noel Dubak. I live at 561 California Road.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: And where is
561 California Road to this property?

MS. DUBAK: The side of my house is
the back of that house, the new house.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Are you the
one that the water runs onto.

MS. DUBAK: I'm the one with the
drainage coming my way. So I have a couple of
questions.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Okay.

MS. DUBAK: One is: It looks like the
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like they would be agreeable to working with
you as the direct neighbor on something that
you can live with.

MS. DUBAK: Okay. That's fine.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: I guess
we're not there yet.

MS. DUBAK: Just want to make a --

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Absolutely.

You have the floor.

MR. PULASKI: I think the architect
can address the initial question about the
elevation of the back of the house versus the
invert going into the dry well. I think you
said that the back of the house is at 82 and
the invert is at 83, but I think the back of
the house is at 86. Can you clarify that?

MR. FINELLI: The existing topography
is probably at 82. Our plan is to raise the
whole back corner of the yard and bring it up
to 86.

I guess just quickly I just wanted to
point out one of the comments or questions is
this -- we keep talking about the water sloping
to this back left-hand corner. I really didn't
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have a lot to say and do with the plan,
obviously the engineer went ahead and did his
drawings, but just the nature of water, if it's
a level yard, it's going to collect and go
straight into the ground. It's not going to
pitch into the corner and cause more of an
overflow into that corner. If anything, it's
going to reduce it because there won't be as
much speed for the water to get to that corner.

It will just permeate into the ground. I guess
one of the questions has to do with
percolation. There were, I believe, four or
five, maybe even six locations that were dug
and, you know, investigated, deep hole tests,
spot hole tests. So if there is any water on
this site, we know where it is, how it moves,
and what's going on with it. How it's getting
to the CULTEC chambers, I can't answer that. I
don't know. I was assuming that there would be
pipes around the entire property, everything
would be pitched correctly and drains and it
would take all the water there. If that's not
shown, I can't sell it because it's not there.

As far as the site walls, I do know
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1. We're trying to make sure that we have a correct plan, a plan that is going to work.
2. MR. BONANNO: After you leave.
3. MS. UHLE: There is a little bit of a difference here, because I think what they're saying right now is the Dubaks may technically be encroaching on their property, and what I'm hearing from Luigi is that they'll work with them.
4. MR. ROGLIANO: Yeah, yeah. Like I said, we're here to -- not, like I said, that we're going to change the plan or do anything, but if it's a matter of moving the wall into my property 6 inches so that we're not tearing down their chain link or encroaching on their garden, then we'll do that.
5. MR. BONANNO: I believe you will do that. The issue that I see is the most prevalent one or the most biggest concern is the water, that the water is accommodated. I know you'll do everything you can not to --
6. MR. ROGLIANO: Just out of curiosity,
7. I know you guys are requesting a grading plan, but shown from the top of the back wall and the
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1. back of the house there is no real grade in the back yard. It's flat.
2. MR. BONANNO: It's going to be at 86; right?
3. MR. ROGLIANO: Yes, and it's going to be at 86 throughout the whole backyard.
4. MS. UHLE: Again, I think some of confusion is there is a grading plan that doesn't show that, and then there is one -- I'm not sure that all of us received the most updated one from Michael McGarvey as well. So there just needs to be coordination between the various sets of plans. So that needs to be clarified.
5. MR. PULASKI: If it's going to be flat at 86, then how does that wall retain it, because -- it has a footing to it?
6. MR. BONANNO: It's a big retaining wall.
7. MR. PULASKI: It says the bottom of the wall is at 83 and a half.
8. MR. FINELLI: I think it means exposed. So the bottom of the wall where it's actually exposed. It will go further into the
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Ground. It's got to go 42 inches by code minimum.

MR. PULASKI: Okay.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: But it says bottom of the wall.

MR. PULASKI: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: But then you do have a slope down there.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: So we need to have --

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Because if you're 86 throughout and then you have a bottom of a wall at 83.5, you are going down 2 and a half inches right there, and it's unclear where that begins. You maybe do need a grading plan.

MR. FINELLI: I think the confusion is it's shown top of wall, bottom of a wall, and there's actually two bottom of the walls. It needs to be clarified.

MS. DUBAK: The question is: How is the chamber going to absorb the water?

MR. BONANNO: It has to slope down.

That's all there is to it. Water doesn't go up, so in the end the slope has to be down. I can assure you, Alan will make sure it goes.
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ground. It's got to go 42 inches by code minimum.

MR. PULASKI: Okay.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: But it says bottom of the wall.

MR. PULASKI: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: But then you do have a slope down there.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: So we need to have --

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Because if you're 86 throughout and then you have a bottom of a wall at 83.5, you are going down 2 and a half inches right there, and it's unclear where that begins. You maybe do need a grading plan.

MR. FINELLI: I think the confusion is it's shown top of wall, bottom of a wall, and there's actually two bottom of the walls. It needs to be clarified.

MS. DUBAK: The question is: How is the chamber going to absorb the water?

MR. BONANNO: It has to slope down.

That's all there is to it. Water doesn't go up, so in the end the slope has to be down. I can assure you, Alan will make sure it goes.
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going to be flat straight across at 86, right, more or less?

MR. FINELLI: 6 inches --

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Because I'm also seeing at the top of wall, bottom of wall in the lower left there right along California Road the top of the wall is 86.5 and the bottom of the wall is 85.5, and at the next increment up, the next spot elevation it's 83.5 at the bottom of the wall and that continues all the way around through the other side up until you get near the Spruce grove where we have finally the bottom of the wall at 84 and then moving up to 85.5 again. This suggests it is sloping down.

MR. FINELLI: I think what you're seeing here is the overlaying of old and new information. I believe the spot elevations were the initial submissions by Mr. McGarvey to Mr. Pilch, and he asked for grading to be shown. He might have misunderstood and thought he meant how does the new relate to the old, but not necessarily a grading plan.

MS. UHLE: I think a cross section.
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MS. DUBAK: I'm finished.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: You're finished. Anyone else?

(No comments.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: All right.

We're going to hold open the public hearing.

With that said, to the extent any member of the Board has any further questions right now that we haven't already touched upon, now would be the time to ask them.

Do you understand what it is that you're going to be coming back with next month?

MR. FINELLI: From an engineering perspective I do. I'm not sure how it's going to get done, but yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Margaret takes copious notes, so I would suggest using her as a resource.

MR. BONANNO: Right, and take your engineer with you next time. You did a good job, but we'll beat up on him.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: I don't know if having the engineer here today would have made it wouldn't have made a
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difference, but just --

MR. FINELLI: I'll have him clarify.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Make sure, because our next meeting is our pre-summer break meeting, so make sure you have --

MR. PULASKI: You could also get a copy of the tape of the meeting so you could review the tape.

MR. BONANNO: Or you could watch it.

Lots of people watch it.

MR. FINELLI: Thank you very much. I guess I'll see you next month.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Yes. Thank you.

Next up will be Application 15-12, 36 Park Avenue. You can set up.

MR. IANNACITO: Good evening, again.

My name is John Iannacito -- oh, we're not ready yet. Should I wait for Margaret to come back or?

MR. BONANNO: Yes. She'll be back quickly.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: She runs this Board. And remember, she takes the notes.
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MR. IANNACITO: Good evening, again.

John Iannacito. I'm an architect, and I'm representing Mr. Alfredo Maiorano this evening, and we're proposing additions and alterations to the existing single family residence located at 36 Park Avenue.

The existing property is currently non-conforming with respect to the lot area, the front yard setback and both side yard setbacks.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: This seems to be your specialty, Mr. Iannacito. Can't you just conform for once?

MR. IANNACITO: The scope of work on this property will include second story additions over the existing footprint. So we're not increasing the footprint of the building at all or the coverage.

I'll quickly go over the floor plans.

Here on the site plan we have a second story addition at the front of the residence, the side, and the rear. On the first floor plan, the addition will include -- will be over the existing garage and then reconfiguration of the
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existing first floor to create a more open floor plan with a living room, dining room, kitchen. On the second floor, it will include additions at the front, side, and the rear with reconfiguration of the space to create bedrooms and two baths.

On the elevations here, the existing roof areas are shown in dotted lines. So here is the proposed second story addition at the front, the addition over the garage, which is actually two stories, first story and second story over the garage. On the side, here's the addition that's over the existing one story garage and the second story addition at the rear, and then the rear elevation includes the addition over the garage and over this one story portion at the rear, and here is the other side showing the addition at the rear and over the front.

On the exterior materials, the wall surfaces will a three coat stucco to match existing, the roof surfaces will be asphalt to match existing, the windows vinyl clad to match existing, trim board will be painted AZEK to
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match existing, and the garage door will be new
and vinyl clad in at brown finish to match
existing also.

The application was presented to the
Zoning Board on April 14th, and area variances
were granted for the front yard setback where
the existing is 10.9 feet, and the proposed
will be the same because we haven't increased
the footprint; the second variance was for the
first side setback, which is currently
4.5 feet, and the proposed will be the same;
and then the third variance was for a second
side yard setback where the existing was 6.03
and the existing will be the same.

Then the application was presented to
the Architectural Review Board on May 7th, and
it was approved as submitted with no further
recommendations.

MR. PULASKI: I would like to say that
I'm very happy with how balanced this project
looks. Usually you make an addition and you
could see the addition and it stands out, and
sometimes it's fine, but this one almost looks
like it was built that way, and I think one of
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the things that really helps make it work is
how the roof line got reworked. It doesn't
show the addition.

MR. IANNACITO: It's basically just a
continuation of the existing hip roof and just
continue that on all the other areas that are
protruding from the main square of the
building, and it tied in nicely.

MR. PULASKI: So I give it a couple of
stars for that.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: This existing garage
is a masonry structure or stucco?

MR. IANNACITO: You mean the existing
block?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The existing block.
MR. IANNACITO: That will stay. As
you see the back of the garage, the one side is
actually on an angle, this area here, so we're
going to maintain that angle on a garage level
and on the first level, and then on the second
floor we're going to actually square off the
building because it just makes the roofs easier
to tie in above, and then we're creating a
smaller hip roof just over this triangle.
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ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: All in favor.

(All aye.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Any further comments?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No. Nice looking project.

MR. BONANNO: You're just matching all the existing colors; right?

MR. IANNACITO: Yes. Redo the roof same color, stucco will be the same, window trim the same.

MR. BONANNO: We're not changing pervious area or anything.

MR. IANNACITO: No, there is no increase at all.

MR. PULASKI: After saying all those nice things, one of the things I'm looking at is this front of the house, and just wondering when you're pulling that wall that's back now to what was the front of the enclosed porch, if that isn't a very tall, flat wall with no feature to it, if there isn't some break to it.
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MR. IANNACITO: I think it's just everything lines up to get the three, and then this piece here sets back a bit about a foot.

MR. PULASKI: Right. That's the piece I'm talking.

MR. IANNACITO: I think this brick staircase in the front, which will remain, and also there's a retaining wall out here right at the curb.

MR. PULASKI: You've gone through ARB, and ARB is fine with it. I'm just giving you some observation and maybe as it comes together there might be something that the designer or the owner might want to do there.

MR. IANNACITO: Anything that comes forward of that facade will require a variance.

MR. BONANNO: I think he's saying some sort of relief across the stucco.

MR. PULASKI: A band or something that helps the windows stand out a little bit.

MR. IANNACITO: We can look at something. I don't know if a band is going to --
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MR. PULASKI: I don't know either.

MR. IANNACITO: I mean, it's very simple with the door and two windows and the other windows above lining up perfectly.

MR. PULASKI: Maybe in the stucco with some of the rough texture and whatever, that can be -- it will all blend very nicely.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: It looks to me like there's a healthy number of windows, and that the windows themselves are going to provide the relief that you're looking for.

MR. PULASKI: It can.

MR. BONANNO: I sort of accede to the people on the ARB to pick up these items.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: The ARB does excellent work, which greatly informs our decisions.

MR. BONANNO: I have no other comments. I think it's a good job.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I like it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: So I'm going to make a motion to approve Application 15-12, 36 Park Avenue.

MR. PULASKI: Second.
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MR. IANNACITO: I think it's just everything lines up to get the three, and then this piece here sets back a bit about a foot.

MR. PULASKI: Right. That's the piece I'm talking.

MR. IANNACITO: I think this brick staircase in the front, which will remain, and also there's a retaining wall out here right at the curb.

MR. PULASKI: You've gone through ARB, and ARB is fine with it. I'm just giving you some observation and maybe as it comes together there might be something that the designer or the owner might want to do there.

MR. IANNACITO: Anything that comes forward of that facade will require a variance.

MR. BONANNO: I think he's saying some sort of relief across the stucco.

MR. PULASKI: A band or something that helps the windows stand out a little bit.

MR. IANNACITO: We can look at something. I don't know if a band is going to --
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MR. PULASKI: I don't know either.

MR. IANNACITO: I mean, it's very simple with the door and two windows and the other windows above lining up perfectly.

MR. PULASKI: Maybe in the stucco with some of the rough texture and whatever, that can be -- it will all blend very nicely.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: It looks to me like there's a healthy number of windows, and that the windows themselves are going to provide the relief that you're looking for.

MR. PULASKI: It can.

MR. BONANNO: I sort of accede to the people on the ARB to pick up these items.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: The ARB does excellent work, which greatly informs our decisions.

MR. BONANNO: I have no other comments. I think it's a good job.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I like it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: So I'm going to make a motion to approve Application 15-12, 36 Park Avenue.

MR. PULASKI: Second.
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1. the footprint of the house is not being extended at all. The only exception to that is we are proposing to add a very shallow front portico that we feel will function, as in typical colonial style homes, provide some shelter from people visiting the home, and we thought it would add some architectural interest to it. You could see the existing front elevation, which technically I’m told is the side elevation, but that’s a different issue. The front elevation, the length of the house was rather bland, heavy roof line, and we thought the portico would add much interest to the front facade. So again, looking at the floor plan, there is absolutely no change to the plan.

The next drawing shows the site plan, which again confirms what I’m saying, there is no impact on any of the setbacks, including the portico.

The Zao’s program really consisted of expanding the second floor. They were very pleased with the existing first floor. They had purchased the house recently, and the
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1. architectural interest to the front of the elevation.

4. I want to emphasize that all materials will match exactly the existing. Siding will match exactly in terms of material and color, the Andersen windows are white, the trim is AZEK, and the 30 year roof will be duplicated as exactly as possible.

10. I think that summarizes the program and our objective, and I would like to answer your questions.

13. ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Mr. Bonanno, certainly having taken the first application off, you must have many questions.

16. MR. BONANNO: I was waiting for you to take the lead here. What is the existing siding?

19. MR. KURTH: It’s HardiePlank.

20. MR. BONANNO: It’s HardiePlank.

21. Gotcha. So everything else is going to remain the same?

22. MR. KURTH: Exactly.

23. MR. BONANNO: The material, the door, the existing, what’s the front door and the
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1. existing second floor only had two bedrooms and one bathroom. So our program, simply stated, was to add a bathroom and another bedroom. In addition to that, the children wanted to have a communal study area, computer area, TV area, etcetera, and the closets were extremely deficient. So our program consists of one bedroom, one bath, a TV area, and numerous new closets.

11. We did go to the Architectural Review Board I believe it was March or April.

13. MS. UHLE: April 2nd.

14. MR. KURTH: This shows the front elevation. The ARB approved the project with one change. The original proposal had in this area here an octagonal window, which the Board unanimously felt was out of character with the house, the neighborhood, etcetera. So we substituted that for a window, and currently the window facades line up horizontally and vertically. We felt, and I think the Board felt that the second floor addition, which we had to obviously raise part of the ridge line to get the proper head room, also added
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MR. BONANNO: Oh, is it?

MR. KURTH: The existing windows do have the divided light. I believe they're the snap-on type.

MR. BONANNO: At the top, not the bottom, or both top and bottom?

MR. KURTH: All of this.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: All the windows in the picture have snap-in grills.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: The chimney remains unchanged in terms of dimensions?

MR. KURTH: Yes. It has to be by code extended higher because of the code requirements of the higher roof.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: What materials will -- will they be matching materials?

MR. KURTH: Brick to match existing.
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ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Is it a functioning chimney?

MR. KURTH: I believe it is, yes.

There's a boiler in the basement.

MR. BONANNO: So do we have an HVAC system; is the existing being upgraded?

MR. KURTH: We're going to add a new zone, two and a half ton unit for the second floor.

MR. BONANNO: Where is the existing unit on the site plan?

MR. KURTH: I believe the existing compressor, if you're talking about that, is in the rear of the property.

MR. BONANNO: It's someplace -- do you have the site plan? Maybe you could point it out, because it's not shown.

MR. KURTH: The compressor is here.

(Indicating.)

MR. BONANNO: It's right there. I always like to ask that they get shielded with some sort of landscaping just to deflect the noise a little bit.

MR. KURTH: I'm sure my client would favor.
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(All aye.)

MR. PULASKI: Margaret, does this addition constitute any change in the dry well sizing?

MS. UHLE: No, because they haven't increased the building footprint. So, no.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: No increase in impervious surfaces or anything?

MR. KURTH: That's correct.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: I'm happy with the plan, subject to that one condition that there be screening on any air conditioning units.

MR. KURTH: We would do it on the existing and proposed.

MR. BONANNO: Great. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Subject to that condition, I move to approve Application 15-16, 24 Warwick Avenue.

MR. PULASKI: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: All in favor.

(All aye.)

MR. KURTH: Thank you very much.
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MR. BONANNO: Congratulations.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: That brings us to our final application of the night, Application 15-26, 104 Highland Avenue.

MR. ABILAMA: Good evening. My name is Tom Abilama, architect for the applicant.

We're proposing to have a subdivision on a lot located at 104 Highland. The subdivision would be for six lots plus a roadway that would be later on dedicated to the town. Everything --

MR. PULASKI: Before we get too far, this is a very preliminary, it's not been a public notice.

MS. UHLE: Yes.

MR. PULASKI: So we're just learning about the site.

MS. UHLE: This is sort of just the foot in the door. What our zoning law does require for subdivision approvals, and it just doesn't come up that often because we're used to two and three lot subdivisions, but it's called a sketch plan. So it's an opportunity just for the applicant to sort of just in a preliminary fashion introduce it to so you have a preview.
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1 this lot here ends up being the longest lot
2 because we have to provide the effective square
3 at this point, and then we can take this
4 portion of the property and like to propose it
5 as an easement to all the properties where a
6 drainage -- storm water drainage will be
7 contained in here, and Mr. Stein from Hudson
8 Engineering will be able to explain that more
9 fully.
10
11 That's my presentation. I would like
12 to show you pictures of the property. This is
13 our property here. Right now there is a
14 remaining structure on it. About two houses
15 away you could see the D'Ambrosio property now
16 as they're starting to build certain structures
17 on it already. All these houses are along
18 Highland Avenue, just for your information.
19 Right now I can ask Mr. Stein to explain the
20 engineering part of it.
21
22 MR. STEIN: Good evening. My name is
23 Michael Stein, President of Hudson Engineering
24 Consulting. We are the engineers of record for
25 the project. Our offices has gone through
26 designing and extensive storm water plan. It's
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1 been designed in accordance with New York State
2 DEC regulations. Prior to going into the
3 design, we start the off doing deep hole and
4 percolation testing when the project started
5 about approximately two or three years ago. We
6 have testing all throughout the site in all the
7 different areas where we're looking at doing
8 storm water management treatment.
9
10 First looking at the individual lots
11 that are going on. Lots 1 through 5, we've
12 actually designed storm water management
13 systems to accommodate all the runoff from both
14 the roof and driveway areas, and it will all be
15 filtered into the ground through the use of
16 CULTEC systems. The roadway itself and
17 cul-de-sac we've added a planted island within
18 the cul-de-sac to try to reduce down the amount
19 of impervious area for the cul-de-sac where
20 plantings could be done so basically the area
21 can be dressed up. Then all the runoff coming
22 from the roadway comes down, is intercepted
23 from a system of catch basins, passes through a
24 mechanic separation device, and then is
25 infiltrated into the ground at this point, and
26 DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER
events, which are -- for example, a 25 year storm before was six inches, now it is 7.61 inches. So we're at an elevated number of quantity of runoff.

MR. BONANNO: On Lot 6 there is no CULTEC; that immediately just goes to the --

MR. STEIN: Yes. That has a direct connection in, and in this area we're using a system that is a little more effective, because CULTEC's you basically have like a 55 gallon drum turned over on half of it, so you only have the half circle of void space. The system that we're using is called Storm Tank. Basically it has a, I think, 95 percent void space on the interior, and it's like milk crates being stacked up. They're H20 loading rated, but they just have a larger void space on the interior so they could hold a larger volume.

MR. BONANNO: And it overflows to the town system for --

MR. STEIN: That's correct.

MR. BONANNO: It's designed for 50?

MR. STEIN: It's designed to mitigate
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all the impacts from a hundred year storm event.

MR. BONANNO: A hundred year storm event. So it's never going to overflow then.

MR. STEIN: I just have to go back and look. I can't say that there's not going to be any release from it, because we're bringing the levels being released from the site to the hundred year storm event. So we're comparing pre to post development conditions. So we may be slowly metering a small amount coming off the site, but we're reducing both the volume and the rate of runoff from the existing conditions.

MR. PULASKI: The soil that was there, is it a well draining soil?

MR. STEIN: Yes. If you look right on the first page, you'll see what our percolation rates were. Especially in the vicinity of here, we are at four inches per hour percolation rate.

MR. PULASKI: Okay.

MR. STEIN: In the vicinity of all the other systems, were going with their respective
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percolation rates that were performed.

MR. PULASKI: The reason why I ask that is, I think the history that I remember of this area is there has been some complaints about drainage, but you're indicating that you have good drainage. So maybe you have a different soil there.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: The property slopes upwards from Highland Avenue toward the back of the --

MR. STEIN: Yes. From this point, it's basically the high point on the site, it drains both to the east and to the north. So that's why we want to make sure that with any overflows that we may have for the systems for each of houses, it's not going to be directed towards that neighbor's property and that it's directed away from there.

MR. PULASKI: I think it's good to have these overflows. It really -- you know, if you get a saturated soil condition, the water will still get away from the property.

MS. UHLE: Just a couple of quick comments that I have is that, actually, I think
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the applicant has done a lot with the storm water management for this phase of the process, which is the sketch plan review. So I just wanted to say to you and also to the applicant, I think what we'll try to do is -- the applicant submitted this -- I met with the applicant a couple of months ago and then they did submit all these materials on the submission deadline for the meeting, but what I would like to do is just have a staff meeting, you know, sit down so that we could kind of consolidate all our comments. I have quite a few comments, but at this point there is some sort of consistency, sometimes the easement is referred to as Lot 7, sometimes the road is referred to as Lot 7 depending on which professional. So I have a lot of kind of just consistency cleanup type comments. I think it would most efficient if I have our highway -- I think the applicant has reached out to the Highway Department, to the Fire Department, to the Police Department, but I would like to get all that documented from town staff so that I could make sure that the Fire Department has
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reviewed even the sketch plan, that the Police
Department has, that our Highway Superintendent
has.

We also have already enlisted a civil
engineer, Kellard Sessions, which did the
engineering review for the 40 Jackson Avenue
application, and then also Phil Greeley, our
traffic engineer, that we use on a regular
basis.

MR. STEIN: We've actually spoken with
both already. I've spoken with Joe Cermele
just to briefly discuss the project. I spoke
with Phil Greeley, because one of the things
that was brought up was the truck
turning radius. I had called Phil before
knowing that he was a representative for the
village, looking to hire them to do the truck
turning radius. We actually had it separately
done by someone else, but that was all based on
my conversation with Phil and it was going
through that aspect. So we're trying to make
sure we're getting everything and we're trying
to consider everything ahead of time.

MS. UHLE: But I don't think they have
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documents to the your engineer.

MS. UHLE: Good. Thank you.

MR. STEIN: Now, one thing I just want
to point, because this is going to come up,
when we originally performed the deep hole and
percolation testing, again that was about two
or three years ago when we first initiated the
project, we had contacted the village and we
spoke with the village to find out if they
needed to witness either --

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Town.

MR. STEIN: I'm sorry, town -- to find
out whether they needed to witness either, and
at that time there wasn't a protocol that they
would witness. So we've done all of testing,
and part of my conversation with Joe Cermele
from Kellard Sessions is that they wanted to
witness the testing. I said, well, we've
already performed it and you're getting brought
in now at the ninth hour to review this. So
that is going to be one of our concerns,
because it's going to be extensive cost for our
client to go back out and retest.

MS. UHLE: I think that is something
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officially acted on behalf of the town yet
either of them. So I think after this meeting
what I would ask the applicant to do is to get
a set of the plans to each of our consultants
so that they could start weighing in on the
conversation as well.

MR. STEIN: I believe a set has
already been delivered to Kellard. As far as
Phil, I could definitely have a set dropped off

MS. UHLE: As I said to you in my
e-mail, especially for Kellard, not so much for
Maser Consulting, but a full package because
there is so much overlap. As you saw tonight
with our other consultant, he actually didn't
receive a full package and things were missing.
Obviously, the civil engineer is going to have
a more significant review than the traffic
engineer. So hopefully between this meeting
and next meeting, you'll have more extensive
staff comments about concerns or any additional
information that may be required.

MR. ABILAMA: I just want to note that
we delivered a set of the drawings and the
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that we need to discuss with our engineer and
our engineer needs to discuss with the Board.

MR. STEIN: We've worked with Kellard
Sessions extensively, so they know our quality
of work. So I'm hoping this doesn't become an
issue.

MS. UHLE: We have within the past few
years witnessed the deep hole tests. So when
the engineer indicated to me that he had spoken
to somebody in the town or in our department,
and I have no recollection of that but that is
very likely true, at that point we may not have
been witnessing them, we probably deferred to
Alan at that point, but we have been within the
past couple of years.

MR. STEIN: We actually just made a
submission on another application within the
past month, and again, we wanted to make sure
that it wasn't something different than here,
we called up, and the first person they spoke
with said, no, we don't witness them, and then
they got put to somebody else that did say, oh,
yes, we come out for the deep test holes.

MS. UHLE: Are you speaking to my
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MS. UHLE: That's either me or Mr. King, so I'm not sure --

MR. STEIN: It wasn't --

MS. UHLE: This is something behind the scenes that we need to discuss, but I get very wary when I hear "we spoke to the town," because the department --

MR. STEIN: Oh, no, we would call planning and building.

MS. UHLE: The department is either me or Mr. King, nobody else, and we would both consult with each other, and we always defer to our engineering. So there should be no individual saying, we don't deep hole tests. I would always call Joe Cermele or Alan Pelch to confirm what they think in necessary.

So with regard to what you did three years ago, whether that's sufficient or not, that we'll have to discuss with Mr. Cermele to see.

MR. BONANNO: Just a quick question.
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ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Okay. So does any member of the Board have any further questions for the applicant at this rather preliminary stage?

MR. PULASKI: Not at this time.

DINA M. MORGAN, REPORTER

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Does the applicant have any further comments? Jim?

MR. BONANNO: Just garbage is private or how do they pick up garbage?

MR. ABILAMA: This road will be a town road.

MR. BONANNO: It's a town road, so the town maintains it.

MS. UHLE: The town does not, as of before my time, the town does not allow private roads any longer. We have a few. I think D'Alessio Court is one. All roads are required to be dedicated to the town. As soon as they're dedicated to the town, then they did get all the services that everybody else gets.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: Does the Planning Board have any influence on naming the road?

MS. UHLE: Not that I'm aware of.

ACTING CHAIRMAN NEMECEK: There isn't another Board that's claimed it, so I make a --

MS. UHLE: Technically it's actually the Town Board when it's dedicated. D'Ambrosio Court was named D'Ambrosio at least in a
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Mr. Abilama: Can I ask you if it's going to be a public hearing the next time, the next board meeting?

Ms. Uhle: I think that's really up to the Board to decide whether you want to begin a public hearing at this phase or whether you want to wait until you are ready to -- at some point you'll approve the sketch plan, which that just means you think, you know, the overall layout, etcetera, is in a form that then they can proceed to do more further detailed analysis. Often sketch plan is not part of a public hearing, although, I will say, Eastchester tends to get the public involved earlier on in the process and people are accustomed to that. So I would have no problem if you wanted to ask the applicant to open the public to schedule the public hearing for the next meeting, it's up to you, or you could wait until September.

Mr. Stein: Would we be able to take a vote for the Board's intent to be lead agency?

Ms. Uhle: Excuse me.
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Mr. Stein: For the Board's intent to be lead agency.

Ms. Uhle: Yes. You're asking if they'll do that this evening?

Mr. Stein: Yes.

Ms. Uhle: You can go ahead and do that this evening.

Acting Chairman Nemecek: I think there really isn't much question. Unless anyone has any objection, I will make a motion that the Town of Eastchester Planning Board be designated the lead agency for SEQRA purposes for Application 15-26.

Mr. Pulaski: Second.

Acting Chairman Nemecek: All in favor.

(All aye.)

(MEETING ADJOURNED.)
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