

SUMMARY OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Re

Proposed Building at 139 Fifth Avenue

March 19, 2019

7:30pm

Attendance:

Joe Marty, Planning Board Chair
Michael Carpenter, Planning Board member
Matthew Margulis, Planning Board member
Ciro Greco, Planning Board member
Nanette Bourne, Village Planning Consultant

Taylor Palmer Esq from Cuddy & Feder presented for the applicant

Proposed Project – Mixed-use development with 35 age-restricted units (20 1 BR, 10 2 BR, and 5 3 BR); 5,154 sf of commercial space, and 35 parking spaces. The project will likely be a modular structure with a variety of sustainable features including solar panels on the roof, a green roof, and a water retention system (grey water?). The applicant presented several changes to the plan including increasing the number of 3-bdr units to 5 (from 2) and increasing the ceiling height of the ground-floor commercial to roughly 14' so the height of the building has increased from 68.4' to 72' (Note: the maximum height permitted by the Business District Floating Zone code is 65'). A variance will be required for the proposed height.

Provident Engineering presented a traffic study that analyzed 4 intersections. The Study projected 16 am peak trips and 21 pm peak trips. No credit was taken for this being an age-restricted project. The study concluded there would be no significant adverse impact to the traffic network. Thirty-five parking spaces will be provided for the 35 residences. No parking for the commercial component will be provided other than street parking. The proposed parking will require a variance from the code.

Catizone Engineering presented an engineering summary. Currently, the site is almost 100% impervious and served by a subsurface detention system. A similar subsurface system will be used. Sewer and Water are proposed from existing service in Fifth Ave. The Engineer will need to provide capacity data to demonstrate the viability of the infrastructure plan.

IQ Landscape Architects presented a conceptual landscaping plan with limited details and perspectives.

Issues and Requests by the Planning Board

The Board:

Asks that the applicant submit a revised Full EAF with supplemental material that includes the revisions made to the project as well as the items noted below.

- Additional details are needed on what it means to be an age-restricted project with 80% of units occupied by 55+.
 - What if there is inadequate market and the 80% cannot be met?
 - What are the tools to enforce the 55+ structure?
 - Please share comparable examples of 55+ developments in the Hudson Valley, and to the extent possible, how they've done financially
- Joins the Architectural Review Board in requesting alternative schemes with a reduced perceived and actual height, with one main objective not being out of scale visually with the building to the immediate south aside.
- Requests, in order to assess the visual impact of a building 72' high from all important vantage points, that the applicant make these views available:
 - A sectional drawing from the buildings on the east side of Fifth Avenue through the proposed building to the houses on the west side of Fourth Avenue (north facing view to capture the existing single-family home adjoining the proposed building on Fourth Avenue).
 - A rendered elevation of the proposed building and the adjoining buildings at 135 Fifth Avenue and 153 Fifth Avenue, showing all details of the adjoining buildings.
 - A perspective drawing of the proposed building from a vantage point on Fifth Avenue north of the building looking south.
 - A perspective drawing of the proposed building from a vantage point on the west side of Fourth Avenue north of the building looking south.
 - A perspective drawing of the proposed building from a vantage point on Sixth Avenue looking west toward the building.
- Architectural attention needs to be paid to the north facing elevation, since the building to the immediate north is several stories shorter and that new party line wall could be visible for decades. The objective is to avoid a large featureless blank wall.
- Notes that the project will remove 30 informal private parking spaces on 4th Avenue and provide 1:1 parking just for the units. No parking for 5,154sf of commercial is being provided other than on-street parking.
 - Board asks for an assessment of whether it is reasonable to presume that large 2 and 3 bedroom apartments will generate need for only one parking spot, citing successful proof of that ratio in comparable Hudson Valley developments
 - Board requests the developer continue its review of how additional parking could be added to the site for retail and residential uses.
 - Board is considering whether a parking Impact Fee is needed.
- Expects that details and modeling demonstrating adequate capacity of the Village's water, sewer & stormwater system will be submitted.
- Requests that the applicant demonstrate the dimensional compliance of the two proposed driveways and the 35 parking spaces with the Village Code. Adequate turning radius for the parking spaces must be demonstrated.
- Requests that additional landscaping details and perspectives be shared, to include realistic drawings along the property line next to residences.
- Requests a Fiscal Impact Study to demonstrate:
 - expected rental income and corresponding expected taxes paid

- the effect of any proposed PILOT and proposed rents will not have an adverse impact on Village or School taxes.
- Requests an assessment of the potential impact this development would have on the school district, to include analysis of whether the 5 3 BR apartments would have a disproportionate contribution of school children. Please cite relevant examples in the Hudson Valley
- Requests a refuse and recycling plan showing location and ingress/egress.