

November 3, 2021

A WORK SESSION OF THE PLANNING BOARD of the Town of Ossining was **held on November 3, 2021 at 7:30 p.m. by Zoom video conference.** Members of the public were able to view and join the meeting via computer or mobile app as follows:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86250420403>

There were present the following members of the Planning Board:

Gareth Hougham, Chairman
Jim Bossinas, Member
Carolyn Stevens, Member
Donna Sharrett, Member

Absent: Jesus Lopez, Member
Sandy Anelli, Secretary

Also Present: Kathy Zalantis, Attorney, Silverberg, Zalantis LLP (Zoom)
Valerie Monastra, AICP, Nelson, Pope & Voorhis, LLC
Daniel Ciarcia, PE, Consulting Town Engineer
Margaret Conn, Secretary

River Knoll Development, 40 Croton Dam Road, Completeness Review of Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)

Dr. Hougham gave a brief explanation to the audience and members of the public. The purpose of this meeting is to review the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) for completeness and relative to what the Planning Board has asked for during the scoping process and the resulting outline document. The outline document is available on the Town's website, for information visit: <https://www.townofossining.com/cms/publications/all-documents/planning-board/planning-board-projects/under-review/river-knoll>. Materials that the Board has now and documents made available to the public are in draft form only, not yet to be relied upon for completeness or correctness until after the Board and Town Consultants ask for changes or additions to be made. Once changes have been made, the Board can accept the document as complete or incomplete. If complete, the Board can schedule a public hearing and at that time the public will be able to offer comments and concerns. Once accepted as a complete document, Dr. Hougham urges the public read it, review it carefully and then come back to the public hearing to speak on it and raise any questions or concerns at that time.

Dr. Hougham asked the applicant, Mr. Glen Vetromile and Applicant's Consulting Engineer, Mr. Robert Peake to give a brief presentation and after this Board members and Town Consultants will have an opportunity to give additional comments regarding completeness of the document.

Mr. Vetromile gave a brief explanation of the new plan and noted that this is an alternative 55+ community plan in response to Town Board, Planning Board and Public Comment. The prior plan was 188 units, this new plan proposes 95 units. According to Mr. Vetromile, this new project is half the size. Some areas addressed in the scoping document are as follows: Land Use, Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Community Character, Wetlands, Soils Topography and Geology, Stormwater Management and Subsurface Water, Vegetation and Wildlife, Historical and Archaeological Resources, Infrastructure and Utilities, Traffic and Transportation, Fiscal Impacts, Construction Impacts.

Mr. Vetromile said the new plan keeps the front meadow along Croton Dam Road open and maintaining the rock-face slope at the steep part of the site. There's an onsite community room with fitness center and pool. The architecture shown is a contemporary farmhouse style. All units will have 2-car garage. Clapboard siding and other fine architectural details. Some units may have a walk out basement area. The plan has greenspace, stormwater swales, two emergency exists, to be used for emergency only (these will be gated off) and a community that will operate at 55+ or over pursuant to Housing for Older Persons Act (HOPA). HOPA is an exception to the federal fair housing laws and permits communities to restrict occupancy based on age.

River Knoll Development – Completeness Review

Ms. Monastra submitted and reviewed her memo dated November 2, 2021, River Knoll Completeness review, with the Board. She noted that her memo will incorporate any new comments from the Board, Town Engineer and Town Attorney. After this session, new comments will be incorporated into a final version for November 17, 2021. The memo is organized by chapter and page number of the DEIS and indicates which items are complete and which are incomplete.

As per Section 617.9(a) of the regulations implementing the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the purpose of this memo is to assist the lead agency in determining whether the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is complete. The lead agency is required to use the final written scope and the standards set forth in 617.9 of the regulations to determine whether to accept the DEIS as adequate with respect to its scope and content for the purpose of commencing public review. Once the DEIS is accepted as adequate for public review, additional substantive comments will be made regarding the impacts and mitigation measures set forth in the document.

Ms. Zalantis submitted and reviewed a memo titled Review of SDEIS, dated November 1, 2021, with the Board. This memo also outlines specific issues that should be addressed prior to the SDEIS being accepted as complete. Also, Ms. Zalantis clarified that currently, the document being reviewed is the applicant's document. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will include the Planning Board's comments. When the applicant is making opinions and statements this is presented as the applicant's opinion.

Ms. Sharrett noted that landscaping information is missing. Vegetative buffer is mentioned throughout the document but there is no plan or reference of what that is. Also, the plan only mentions street trees within the project, none along Croton Dam Road. Ms. Sharrett recommended the applicant provide a landscape plan identifying trees and plants with their scientific Latin names and common names. Ms. Sharrett has made this recommendation in previous meetings and in review of the scoping document.

Mr. Bossinas noted he would like to suggest requiring a vegetative buffer similar to what is required in the Residential to General Business Zoning, more screening in between the existing homes and the new project. Also, a comparison to conventional zoning which is R-15 rather than R-5. Ms. Stevens is in agreement with Mr. Bossinas' recommendation of zoning comparison to the current zoning R-15.

Dr. Hougham raised a question about whether the view shed impact be discussed, in speaking about what the project looks like from both nearby communities and from a distance. This was done in the original project in particular because it would be quite prominent on top of the hill from surrounding areas. There needs to be a section that speaks about view shed impact.

Ms. Monastra raised points in the memo with regard to Land Use, Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Community character and items found to be incomplete. One was that there was no comparison need to the surrounding neighborhoods and no visual impacts from the post project from the various vantage points on the surrounding neighborhoods from the Hudson River which was specifically identified in the scope along with no discussion on lighting. Also, this section does not discuss Westchester County 2019 Housing Needs Assessment. The section does not discuss consistency with the proposed plan draft documents that are available.

Ms. Monastra continued. In section 2F this section does not address the potential impacts of proposed MF zoning district, to the MF2 Multi-Family zoning district. Also for clarification, the MF zoning district is the one that they're proposing now, where the MF2 zoning district was the one they were proposing before. In section 2. G more information is needed to complete the discussion of any possible relevance to spot Zoning. This was an issue that was brought up and it was very, very brief. We felt that it did not really discuss in detail the issue of spot zoning and why this would, or would not, constitute spot zoning. There is also some discrepancy within the document, whether it's a total 98 units versus 95 units. The total number of units needs to be identified and worked out. Landscaping we also noted was referenced but no plan was provided. Renderings were provided but no elevations and no zoning table was provided. needs to be discussed in the narrative that coincides with the items that Donna was bringing up earlier.

River Knoll Development – Completeness Review

Mitigation portions of this particular chapter we're very brief and landscaping was referenced but no plan was provided. Areas to preserve also have not been identified and layout plan. This concludes Ms. Monastra's comments on this section.

Ms. Zalantis noted three instances where the applicant is making statements that have to be identified as the applicant's opinion. It's in the context of recreational, for example, the document says, it's the applicant's intention to provide extensive onsite recreational opportunities, so there will be little recreational impacts associated with the proposed project. That conclusion is the applicant's opinion. There are two other instances like that.

Mr. Ciarcia said he looked at the stormwater found it comprehensive as far as completeness. This will be reviewed in more detail once the document is accepted with more focus on the storm water utilities. With the prior application, there was more density so what was concluded on the other project is that the water and sewer can be handled. With a lesser number of units, that still holds true and looking at the underlying infrastructure issues.

Ms. Sharrett noted with regard to lighting, they're showing pictures and they have a lot of pictures of different projects, some of them have very large walls of windows and most of the lighting we're talking about are exterior lights, but when you have large walls windows like that, lights are going to be very visible and if there is these vaulted lights Ms. Sharrett would like to see what impact that has on the neighbors and the Hudson River and how those are going to be screened. Also if there are two-car garages, but when looking at the pictures, there is a one car garage, it's hard to tell what it is we're looking at. Ms. Monastra said this is probably a more substantive comment as opposed to completeness comment, but we can ask for clarification of visual images they submitted as to what those images are to convey.

Ms. Sharrett also noted on the sidewalks, it says there's no sidewalks because there's not going to be a lot of traffic and we're going to be walking in the road. This should be explained more. Why they think there's going to be so little traffic in ninety-eight units of people walking on the roads is not going to be a problem, particularly with our current culture of having every little minutia of our life delivered to us in these zooming delivery trucks. This is something that should be addressed.

Dr. Hougham had a comment about the emergency exits. When discussing this in previous meetings, we got agreement from the applicant that those would also be for a pedestrian use and it mentioned that use in his introduction but it's not written or at least it's not shown on the plans that way. Dr. Hougham recommends that it say "emergency vehicle exit and permanent pedestrian and bicycle access", not just emergency pedestrian access. Dr. Hougham would like to see that specified in the plans as well as discussed. Also, previously discussed was having openings from some of the adjacent avenues like First and Second Avenue. That was not included in this plan. If the applicant still agrees to include that to show it.

Ms. Monastra noted the next chapter is wetlands. This project is not anticipating disturbing the wetlands or having any sort of wetlands buffer area, so there was a couple of minor comments. The Village has updated their wetlands law so this should reflect that new law and then the section doesn't discuss potential new disturbance to watercourses and watercourse buffers as a result of the project, including any new analysis, any impact to vegetative cover the proposed project and a comparison is not made to the impacts identified into the 2018 DEIS of the former project to the proposed project. This particular chapter can easily be updated, it just needs to be what's required in the scope.

Dr. Hougham said potential impacts to the Sing Sing Kill be addressed. The wetland which is down the hill from here. If there is additional volume being sent to the Sing Sing Kill as opposed to the other side. Dr. Hougham said he would like to thank the applicant for the color drawings and plans showing that. It was very helpful but Dr. Hougham is still concerned about the impact on the Sing Sing Kill. This should be discussed specifically.

River Knoll Development – Completeness Review

Ms. Monastra pointed out that this is also a substantive comment. There isn't anything about Sing Sing Kill in the in the scope right now. We specifically are just asking for new disturbance to, or crossing of wetlands and buffers. At this point in time, they're proposing not to have any disturbance the wetland buffer area or the wetlands themselves, but we can ask specifically about the Sing Sing Kill in the next round as part of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

The next chapter is soils. Topography, steep slopes and geology chapter. There's a few concerns in terms of completeness. First, is the narrative notes that blasting may be required and we really felt this overall that it didn't really provide a lot of information as to the amount of blasting. There is one part of the narrative where it discusses that it may be required. Then another part of narrative says that a hydraulic camera would be used instead of blasting, but then there's a tremendous amount of times throughout the document that they talk about blasting. More information on blasting, rock removal, the duration and overall intensity of that is important.

In terms of steep slopes, the applicant does not provide information on compliance with the steep slopes protection law, section 167.2 of the Ossining code. One of the things that is really important is that there is certain prohibitions on extremely steep slopes and that needs to be rectified in terms of their overall project. There are some waivers the planning board can provide, but then the applicant really needs to provide information as to why those waivers would be met. Another thing that is really important deals with the overall conditions that the project meets outlined in section 167.5, dealing with overall cut and fill of the site and the plans that were provided are not adequate enough to relay to the public as to the intensity of the cut and fill that's going to take place on site. There are certain areas in which the fill itself was looking to be over 20 feet in terms of leveling out the proposed project site. We feel that there's just not enough information for the public to really adequately understand what they're proposing to do on site and the impacts involved with that. To some extent, the steep slopes regulations could affect the overall project and what they're proposing at this point.

Ms. Zalantis had a similar comment about extremely steep slopes. It's not addressed adequately. There is a prohibition in the code and you're allowed to grant a waiver under certain circumstances and namely that is only be for ingress and egress and subject to certain requirements. Without knowing what the areas are and what's being proposed, there's no discussion of it in the document. It's really hard to ascertain whether they even meet compliance with this provision when they're admitting that there will be 10% disturbance of extremely steep slope areas. That's something that that that needs to be clarified and further detail provided to really understand the proposed impact. It could impact a whole project design potentially. There was a section for mitigation measures that were discussed in the section of proposed project and needs to be taken out or made clear. All the mitigation measures should be in one section and not discussed in the proposed project section.

Ms. Sharrett noted in 3.C .6, where it talks about the permitted hours of construction as required by our noise code, because this is going to affect the public, it would be great to list those hours so they are clearly outlined and people don't have to try to figure that out. Hopefully, that makes it easier for the public.

Mr. Ciarcia said there is a lot of cut and fill going on. One important thing and Mr. Ciarcia wants to make sure that the Board was aware of, which relates to earlier comments regarding the buffering to the adjacent properties and actually even the comment about the access trail for the homes in the village, is the retaining wall behind the village boundary in some areas gets as high as 34 feet. Mr. Ciarcia did not see any sections, or anything going through there, but the Board and the public really need to see a section through there to see the scale of how this wall is going to be looming above the houses below and then you have the actual townhouses above that. It's going to be quite a substantial. Screening is critical to soften the impact which is going to be substantial. Dr. Hougham asked how best to ask the applicant to show the cut and fill better than they do. Is it more of a descriptive thing, calculations, or showing cross sections graphically?

Mr. Ciarcia said, it's less about the steep slopes guarantee because you can recreate a site and not really have a major impact on adjacent properties. This is really more of an aesthetics issue. It's not about how much cut and fill is moving around the site, it's really just what's going to be looming over those homes on that side of the project. Ms. Monastra agreed but because the Town has a steep slopes law, there has to be some consideration taken to make sure that the proposed project right now is going to conform to that law.

River Knoll Development – Completeness Review

Mr. Ciarcia said the road you enter and you make a left and go up the hill that is work generally following what's there now. Those units will sit on where the existing buildings are and the tricky thing is the other set townhouses on that other road. The extension of the access road, that's a steeper area and developing the homes and putting an access road through there is really more of a challenge that's the tougher part of the site to develop. This can be touched on in the narrative and they need to make the case to be working in these extremely steep slopes. The narrative should demonstrate that they're developing the site in the in the most sensible way.

The next chapter is stormwater management and subsurface water. Ms. Monastra said she looked at it directly and identified certain elements that were not according to the scope, or we're not included, as per the scope. First is the proposed project and mitigation, again those two should be separate. Pre and post development watershed maps are not included. There was another discussion on the potential impact of erosion, sedimentation and storm water control waters during construction post construction completion. Means of intercepting storm water and associated materials were discussed, but we felt that the section does not address the potential short and long term impacts of runoff carrying fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides that we specifically requested them to provide a little bit of a narrative on that. Also, we wanted them to provide number of acres of impervious coverage of the proposed project. Because there are some changes to that, it just needs to be clear as to what is being provided as part of the project in terms of impervious coverage and storm water and then some of those same elements discussed previously needed to be brought into the mitigation measures.

Mr. Ciarcia briefly went through the Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan (SWPPP) document. It looks like they covered the basics. Mr. Ciarcia will need to look into it in more detail. On the SWPPP document received they were included in a pocket within the SWPPP. It looks like they over detained limited the peak flows and that may be in some ways related to the downstream conveyances. We will look into the document to make it's reducing the runoff rate below pre development levels. We need to be sure that pre development levels could be accommodated by the downstream infrastructure. Mr. Ciarcia will ask them to include that in there in the analysis included in their SWPPP.

Dr. Hougham reiterated the need to specifically address stormwater impacts to the Sing Sing Kill which is downhill from the site and since the drainage patterns are different now than they were originally. Dr. Hougham wants to make sure that all those calculations are complete with respect to volume and rate of runoff as usual. Dr. Hougham asked the Board for any additional comments on this. There were none at this time.

Ms. Monastra discussed vegetation and wildlife. This section needed a lot more information. First, this section was done for the former project, it specifically said it was going to list tier three and tier four species located on the property. This was not done in terms of the proposed project. We felt that the section did not discuss compliance with the Town's tree law. Information on outdoor lighting and potential light trespass of outdoor lighting to habitat also is not provided. Landscaping plan was not provided and we felt that an updated letter from New York State National Heritage Program is needed the last one was from 2016. The mitigation section did not provide an invasive species removal and management plan and the section does not make clear statement regarding protection of preserve tree roots systems. Overall there's a lot more information needed in order to have this particular chapter complete in terms of understanding the impacts on the vegetation wildlife.

Ms. Sharrett commented and for the public's information, if you're tier three and tier four invasive species, that is a listing by Hudson Valley Prism Index. Then on mitigation, the removal and management plan should also include the duration and intended duration of the management plan. On three, five and six they reference that all these changes can be made as required by the owner's field representative. Mr. Sharrett is not in agreement that someone representing the owner would make the calls for those changes. It should be someone like the Town's Tree Warden. Ms. Monastra said this can be noted as "it's the applicant's intent", so that it's clear that the board is not agreeing with that and then that can be a comment that we ask them to address.

River Knoll Development – Completeness Review

Mr. Bossinas said, in general, the applicant is proposing attractive details throughout the project. He wants them to address the screening and specifically that retaining wall brought up earlier by Mr. Ciarcia.

Ms. Monastra continued with historical and archeological resources and infrastructure and utilities. We found both those chapters complete. Mr. Ciarcia previously felt that they addressed the issues and he didn't foresee any utility or infrastructure concerns. Dr. Hougham asked Board members if they had any comments or concerns with either one of these issues. There were none.

The next chapter is a traffic and transportation. The Town is retaining a traffic engineer, they will have a comment letter on completeness by November 8th for consideration. The Town is retaining John Canning from Kimley Horn. He will be part of the project team and as requested by this Board, he was not involved in prior projects but is familiar with Westchester County. In terms of our comments on completeness, we only had one comment in this section which dealt with the number of employees by phase. They do not include the number of employees by phase which is required by the scoping document. Other traffic comments may be forthcoming. Ms. Monastra will take any comments that the Board may have on that section and work that into the next memo. The last round that was going to be more intensive traffic at that intersection Route 9A. The traffic engineer will have comments on completeness and then they'll have more substantive comments as we go through the FEIS process.

Ms. Zalantis noted that we did not to see a response to the scope's H.2.A. which was the description of internal vehicle transportation discussion, proposed bicycle parking lot and a discussion of how the proposed project aligns with the Town's complete street policies in the scope H.2.B. and also had the same point Ms. Monastra made earlier, wants the board to be clear that they're no longer proposing the mitigation measures of the prior projects that were proposed at the intersection of New York Route 9A and Croton Dam Road and the traffic engineer is really going to have to review that. They're taking the position that that could be a mitigation, or not, if it was not a required, they're not required to do that mitigation as part of this project, but that's something that the Town can consider doing on its own. That is the position taken in the document. We need our traffic engineer to review that to see if that's supported or if that position has merit if there is no longer the need for that prior traffic mitigation measure.

Dr. Hougham said these traffic issues are bound to be one of the most important topics of discussion for the Community. These issues of additional delays at the light at that intersection are very critical to understand very well and to understand the alternatives. Dr. Hougham asked the Board for comments or questions. Board members agreed to wait for the Town's Traffic Consultant report for more information on this.

The next item is Community facilities and fiscal impacts. Ms. Monastra noted the comment was that the scope required that they would look for specifically other 55 and older communities, examples of student generation that was not provided also the age restriction regulations anticipated for the 55 and older and this needs to be discussed as well because there's different variations of 55 and older restrictions dealing with who's living in your apartments and we feel that that needs to be clarified because they keep stating that there'll be no school kids. There needs to be some clarification as to what the restrictions would be for this overall site. They also need to provide the specific examples and comparable. It does not include a discussion on the proposed contribution to the Ossining School District as identified in 2018 DEIS. At this point, they're and not anticipating making a contribution to the Ossining School District. Those comparisons need to be clarified a little bit more and more information is needed to demonstrate their backing of the "no kids". I understand they use the Rutgers numbers, but a lot of times the Rutgers numbers are basically standard. It's best to actually have case studies and examples from comparable developments.

Ms. Zalantis also agreed that there needs to be more clarification because it sounds like an overstatement to say definitively that "no school aged children will reside within this community". I don't know what the support is to say that. Dr. Hougham said if there are different interpretations of that, they would have to be very clear what they're referencing and whether or not within regulations of the Town of Ossining. This will need serious clarification.

River Knoll Development – Completeness Review

Mr. Bossinas noted during the presentation of the previous projects, the apartment complex, the applicant submitted information on similar projects elsewhere to justify the numbers and they were pretty close to what they were presenting so there's no reason why we can't do the same on this on this project.

Ms. Stevens noted that WXY, who is also doing work on the master plan, have done some so a number of school studies for New Rochelle and I think at least one or two others. I thought they were doing some work in the area and maybe if we want to have some additional support one way, or the other, it's a thought, since they're already doing some work on the Master plan. Ms. Monastra thought this may have been Tarrytown. They did school generation of multifamily housing but the applicant can easily provide this information. They just need to make the phone calls and do the work.

One of the last chapters that they had to take a look at was construction impacts and again our biggest concern with the rock removal and the blasting. Both in terms of the intensity information on what's really going to be required and also the overall construction management plan was missing. The biggest concern is neighboring properties and what is really going to be required and the work that that's going to be entailed in that.

Ms. Sharrett noted they're saying they're going to be basically working every day and the holidays and the neighbors would have to deal with this every single day, which is completely unreasonable. Ms. Monastra said this was checked out and it conforms to Town Code. Ms. Sharrett said it is 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays, Sundays and Holidays. That's completely unreasonable but maybe that's for a discussion for different time. Under construction sequence, there's a couple of comments. Right before they demolish the existing buildings, it's my understanding because I had to go through this with the demolition of an adjacent building and I wasn't notified, I had on my windows open, and I believe the Town Board did change that that the neighbors have to be notified, so in that construct that would have to be checked and they should be notified before there's demolition or any kind of blasting but that would have to go into that construction sequence. I do think that neighbors should be notified on either blasting or the demolition, so they can close their windows.

Ms. Sharrett also asked if they could identify how they're going to determine the contaminants that are involved in these buildings before all that dust is released. Is this something they can include in the document, an analysis of what contaminants are determined to be in those buildings, because it could be a number of things. This would be an impact. Dr. Hougham agreed and was going to bring that point up as well, both the asbestos and lead paint could be present. During demolition in these very old buildings usually the lead paint can get airborne and that can be a problem so it should be discussed.

Ms. Sharrett said water can be used to control dust, they can wash down anything with water. This is what happened behind her home. They ran a hose up and down when they were demolishing the building and the dust was enveloping the house. When she consulted the building department, she was told at best 60% of the dust can be contained. This information should be in here if they're going to be doing the demolition and they should state how much material is going to be passing on to other onto the residents properties and what mitigation measures can do to prevent that, or what they will do afterwards if anybody gets all this stuff on their properties, because some of those houses are close to some of those old buildings. The applicant needs to provide more detailed information about that, and if there's alternative methods that would be less impactful to the neighbors.

Dr. Hougham said he supports Donna's notion on the contaminants. Many times with demolitions where contractors just sort of wave water around and really does not contain it. I don't know if this is getting more specific than what we should be doing, but I should mention that they should least discuss the option of monitoring during the demolition process discuss what alternatives exist for monitoring airborne contaminants. There were no further comments on this section.

This section is alternatives. One comment is that this prohibits disturbance of extremely steep slopes. The way they have the layouts for each one of the alternatives the assumption is they are going to disturb those extremely steep slopes. There is also an assumption that they will be also disturbing wetlands and wetland buffer areas and from the Subdivision Chapter 176.18 F, there is specific requirements for excluding lots as developable area in terms of that at least 75% of the minimum lot area requirement of a proposed lot shall neither consists of wetland nor extremely steep slopes.

River Knoll Development – Completeness Review

This was not done in what they're proposing for the alternatives. The concern is that the alternatives as presented do not reflect a true depiction of what could be built on that site. This goes back to Mr. Bossinas' comments dealing with the conventional subdivision lot.

In terms of one of the alternatives, was to take the sort of conventional subdivision lot and cluster that. What they ultimately did was the conventional subdivision they said they could get 30 lots and then with the clustering they said they get 35 and that's not the intent of that alternative analysis. It is meant to take the conventional subdivision lot and then cluster it so that you could see what a cluster design would look like on that particular site. There are changes that they need to make to each one of those alternatives and then that will affect their overall comparison to the proposed action.

Ms. Zalantis noted her memo raised similar comments to what Ms. Monastra just said about the steep slopes. They say that they did a calculation, based on the town steep slopes regulations, but in the other alternatives there's not that similar language so it's not comparing apples to apples. The Board needs further clarification on that in the alternative, so that we can ensure that what the Board is assessing are actual true alternatives. Dr. Hougham said he wanted to point out that this was a serious area of contention in the last in discussions with the community. The last in the original process of proposal and so it's very important that the alternatives that are presented are ironclad approvable plans. This is very important.

Ms. Monastra will incorporate all comments into the overall memo/table which can be discussed it at the November 17, 2021 meeting. The Board can adopt those as comments on completeness and send those to the applicant. Ms. Sharrett wanted to emphasize outdoor lighting impacts and also the glow of interior structures and the impact or the screening for that, looking at walls of windows is not great, if they can screen it that would be fine. They need to show the screening. Ms. Monastra said they can also show a photometric plan to just to demonstrate that lighting is not going to extend beyond the property boundaries.

Dr. Hougham's last comment is to emphasize that the three dimensional views are very important for the Board and the Community to understand the proposal. In the past we had asked for a 3D model. Those models can be inserted into Google earth very easily by any member of the public, so they can see what a given project would look like from their house, this is easy to do. I would like to ask again that that be included. Ms. Monastra said this is in the scope. The Board asked for visual analysis, such as site sections photographic or video simulations 3D computer modeling etc. used to generate images of potential visual impacts of the post project and various vantage points on the surrounding neighborhood and including visual impacts to and from the Hudson River.

Dr. Hougham asked if more specifically, an active solid model so that you end up with a file that that you can distribute and people can just import it into Google earth so then the solid model just gets super imposed on existing satellite data and you can see what something actually looks like and it's easy to do.

Ms. Sharrett recommended having a time limit on public hearing comments if they are the same comments repeated by different people. Ms. Monastra recommended asking for written comment from the public. Mr. Bossinas recommended giving a specific time limit for speaking, like in past meetings. Ms. Stevens recommended a signup sheet and if there are a lot of speakers the hearing can be continued to a second meeting where the next group can speak. There are a few different options and if the meetings go back to in person there would have to be an appropriate venue. The Board will review different options.

At this time, Mr. Peake thanked the Board and said they will be looking forward to the final memo. Mr. Vetromile said some of the things that are being asked appear to be things that we'll get into at the formal site plan stage of the process, like a detailed landscaping plan. Other than having a very kind of cursory landscape plan today or a narrative as to kind of the trees and things that we will try to use to get into detail but I'm not about to get into a detailed landscaping plan when we're still at a conceptual level seems to me to be just useless work.

River Knoll Development – Completeness Review

Mr. Vetromile said, they've already been through this planning process for a long time and the alternatives. Mr. Vetromile said in 2018 and 2019 they spent 15 months shooting alternative plans back and forth with FP Clark. He said they paid them upwards of \$50,000 for their alternative analysis review of our analysis and paid architects at least another \$50,000. So all of those plans were reviewed by FP Clark and there's all sorts of dialogue emails documents flowing back and forth between us verifying those plans. The planning board and consultant had blessed those alternatives, and it's Mr. Vetromile's concern now is \$100,000 later in a year and three months of time spent with FP Clark preparing those alternative plans now being asked to revise them again is just useless work.

Ms. Zalantis clarified to Mr. Vetromile that the Board never got to a stage where there is an accepted EIS. There's not a document that was in a final form that was blessed. Currently, the document is not complete and doesn't comply with the scope, so that needs to be addressed as outlined.

Mr. Vetromile did not agree with that statement. He said the ones that are being circulated to everybody we're reviewed by FP Clark and was given to their traffic consultants internally to confirm the traffic impacts to control confirm the fiscal impacts.

Dr. Hougham reiterated to Mr. Vetromile that the Board needs to have each one of those alternatives validated or having independent validation of the proven ability of those alternatives is really critical otherwise that community will not accept them as valid comparison points. This has to be in the document. Ms. Monastra said the Board is trying to get a better sense of what a realistic conventional subdivision layout would look like and what a cluster subdivision layout would look like.

Mr. Vetromile was not in agreement with this. Dr. Hougham emphasized the importance that the alternatives be approvable and that was something that the community spoke very strongly on and rightfully so, insisting that they are fully valid alternatives.

In disagreement, Mr. Vetromile said, he has had discussions with the town board and the prior planning board about this and now they're being asked again to revise them. After some discussion on alternatives and the issue of a detailed landscape plan, which are needed as part of this review, Ms. Monastra said they will finish reviewing the document incorporate comments and submit those to the Board and the Board will submit those back. The Board will be voting on November 17, 2021 on the completeness of it and at that point they can take into consideration Mr. Vetromile's comments from tonight.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Stevens, seconded by Ms. Sharrett and it was unanimously passed by the Board adjourn the Planning Board Work Session to a regular Planning Board meeting set for November 17, 2021.

Time Ended 9:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Anelli

Sandra Anelli, Secretary
Town of Ossining Planning Board

APPROVED: January 19, 2022