

The Minutes of the Village of Haverstraw Planning Board Meeting on Monday January 10, 2022 beginning at 7:00 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL :

- | | |
|--|---------|
| • Edwin Molina (Chairman) | Present |
| • Dennis Michaels (Asst. Village Attorney) | Present |
| • Ruben Berrios (Building Inspector) | Present |
| • Eve Mancuso (Village Engineer) | Present |
| • Diogenes Dominguez | Present |
| • Danny Scaffidi | Present |
| • Joseph Coe | Present |
| • Perry Masiello | Present |
| • Bart Gordon | Present |
| • Gisbeth Ramos (Clerk to Planning Board) | Present |



Chairman Molina invited the first *formal* applicant to present to the Board.

Jessie Cokeley, Colliers Engineering for 49 West Broad Street-Village Square: Mr. Cokeley informed the Board that they were planning to work out the matter regarding the entrance/egress and they were trying to relocate parking spaces in the offsite area to reach minimum requirement for Village. He presented new renderings to Board showing the visual effects of the 5-story building. Mr. Cokeley explained that the pictures show the “leaf off” condition with the architecture’s exact dimensions and with overlaid images which gives a visual perspective from various vantage points. Mr. Cokeley proceeded to explain each picture:

- East down W. Broad from Hudson, but not at the top of Hudson because the townhomes would block the new building.
- From the area near the church on Hudson: you can see 1 story, maybe 2
- From the intersection at Main & Clove looking northwest. From this vantage point you would be able to see the most exposure of the building because you’re at ground level.
- Looking up W. Broad from the parking lot; all 5 stories will be visible.

- Pictures 6A & 6B are with the church in view - looking northeast and on Hudson looking down Main. From this vantage point the building isn't visible at all.
- From State St.; even the church isn't visible and that is higher than the proposed 5 story building so the new building can't be seen.

Dan Richmond, attorney for the applicant: Mr. Richmond stated that the project will have a very limited visual impact and the pictures show that the building fits in well with the neighborhood. He also stated that the project fits in with the Village's Comp Plan and goals, and that they've worked hard to meet the Village's concerns. Mr. Richmond expressed that this would be a top notch project and would add to the attractiveness of the area. They were before the Planning Board on a referral from the Village Board to answer in any questions the Planning Board may have.

Mr. Cokeley explained that some variances needed for the projects are existing conditions and since the footprint is in the same condition/location the variances would carry over.

Joe Coe commented that the photos were helpful and asked if they had a drop-in scale photo from the original location presented, from Clove Ave. He also asked why they didn't provide it with these photos.

Mr. Cokeley responded that they felt they had already provided a version of that with the google depiction at the prior meeting but they will provide a photo depiction if the Board wants it.

Eve Mancuso asked about the structural evaluation that was to be performed and if there had been a definitive answer as to the existing building being sound enough to use the existing structure to add additional floors.

Avram Schwartz, property owner: Mr. Schwartz responded that the architect was still working on that.

Ms. Mancuso commented that there had been some discussion on the position of the building, the secondary access onto Clove, which was discussed, and the dimensions of the structures in the immediate/adjoining area being on the plans.

Mr. Cokeley responded that they will add that to the plans.

Ms. Mancuso further stated that it was unclear where access to the building was. The rendering shows a pedestrian interconnection from the parking lot into the building but the site plan doesn't allow for that. On the layout the only way to get into the entry lobby is through what's designated as the handicap accessible stall markings. On the architectural rendering there's a sidewalk that wraps around the building. The sidewalk is preferred but there may not be enough land area left to be able to do that. This would have to be looked at since there's also an issue with head-on parking into the building and Ms. Mancuso stated that this may not be allowed and also the 24 ft aisle is immediately adjacent to the building leaving no ability to flower the area. These issues need to be discussed and resolved as they will affect the parking and the footprint. Ms. Mancuso continued to enumerate the items in her review letter, commenting that when issues have been worked out with the Village Board the Planning Board would want to see the details. In addition she instructed the applicant representatives to consider, when preparing the site plan, where they would be staging deliveries on the property.

Mr. Richmond expressed that he believed most of the items discussed were site plan issues and that they were going to be addressed with the site plan. He reiterated that the applicant wants to be in compliance with and work with the Village on this project and that the project is a good fit for the community.

Perry Masiello asked about incorporating commercial space with the project.

Mr. Richmond responded that they were planning to include a café with the plans.

Chairman Molina asked the applicant/representatives to expand on the matter of the building being 4 stories rather than 5 stories as some Board members still had some issues with the height.

Avram Schwartz, property owner: Mr. Schwartz explained to the Board that this project had started pre-COVID and since then the cost of construction has gone up drastically. Everything is higher/more expensive and with simple calculations based on the square footage and on the number of units plus the streetscape improvements, the moving

of the basketball courts and creating additional parking, to make this project financially feasible they can't build less than 5 stories.

Mr. Richmond remarked that the cost of the building plus the amenities to the Village had to be considered when deciding the number of units in the building and therefore its height.

Chairman Molina stated that he'd like to hear from the Mayor, who was sitting in the audience for the presentation, regarding the height of the building, parking, its impact on the village and the visual impact on the surrounding neighbors. He also asked the Mayor if he could address any long range plans that might be associated with this.

Mayor Kohut informed the Board that the Village Board originally wanted 4 stories as well but as the project and plans progressed and the applicant explained the reasoning why they needed to go to 5 the Board didn't disagree. As to the parking, the current project plan was suggested by the Village as a way to make the project work as the building has been neglected and abandoned for 25 years. The Village wouldn't be losing the basketball courts, just moving them to an area that will become more of a fitness area and this would pick up 40 to 50 additional parking spaces in the Knights of Columbus lot. If the Village ever gets the funding for it, the plan is to erect a parking garage on the Knights of Columbus lot as the bigger footprint of that lot would allow for a parking garage. In summary, the Village wanted less regarding the building and Mr. Schwartz wanted more and, with the addition of an on-site Superintendent in the building which the Village asked for the conclusion was that this project would remove the eyesore and bring a different element to the downtown area.

Mr. Richmond remarked that the applicant originally proposed 6 story building.

Chairman Molina asked the Board members if they had any further questions from the Mayor, which they did not. He further summarized the concerns of the Board, stating that they wanted a second egress/entrance onto Clove Ave and for the parking to be further explored to accommodate more on site.

With no further questions or comments regarding the project the Board asked Attorney Michaels to draft the Resolution.

Counselor Michaels drafted the following:

Motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees that they look upon this project and application for a special use permit and the application of the floating zone, PR-I plan incentive of a floating zone, to be applied to this project with the following concerns, suggestions and/or requests; that a second means of egress be included off of Clove Ave. and that the parking requirements be addressed to the satisfaction of the Village Planner and Village Engineer. In addition, the Planning Board asks the Village Board of Trustees to consider all the comments enumerated in the letter from Eve Mancuso, Village Engineer, dated December 13, 2021.

RESOLUTION # 1 - 2022

As recited by legal counsel

Motion by: Diogenes Dominguez

Seconded by: Joseph Coe

Roll Call:

Ed Molina	- Yes
Diogenes Dominguez	- Yes
Dan Scaffidi	- Yes
Joseph Coe	- Yes
Perry Masiello	- Yes
Bart Gordon	- Yes

Motion Carries: All

Chairman Molina invited the applicant, CARP – 57 Route 9W to make their *informal* presentation for a proposed second story addition.

Mr. Yang, owner of the property, informed the Board that they were currently an Engineering company and they create a specific design of a heating element to help their customers do laboratory testing. It's a one-of-a-kind design. They need more space for testing, offices and storage on the second floor. Explaining to the Board the drawings they had in front of them, Mr. Yang pointed out the current first floor at 6,000 square feet with 3 offices and 1 conference room.

Inspector Berrios asked the Board members if they were familiar with the building Mr. Yang was speaking about, confirming that it was the Max Auto & Repair building by the cemetery.

Mr. Yang continued to explain the plans and the second floor layout including offices, restroom(s), assembly room etc. To get to the second floor they propose a staircase on the north side of the building. He presented renderings of what the building would look like, explaining the view from the north side and from the front. The look of the building with the addition would be an improvement from its current condition as windows, firewall and grass area are being added. Safety railing would be installed and they are installing a pipe for testing purposes. Mr. Yang explained the renderings from each side of the building.

Ed Molina asked if the garage doors shown on the plan were preexisting or new with the addition.

Mr. Yang responded that they were currently a part of the building.

Ed Molina asked for confirmation that the building would be for the exact same manufacturing and testing use, only more of it.

Mr. Yang confirmed this explaining where in the building they would be doing air testing. He continued with the parking situation, stating that they have 9 parking spots and 6 employees. Two employees don't drive because they live in Haverstraw so parking shouldn't be an issue. If necessary they can park on the side of the driveway because it is 14 ft. across.

Bart Gordon asked if they had any public parking.

Mr. Yang responded that they have a problem with that and he has recently spoken to Inspector Berrios about it. In the future they would like a sidewalk installed here because pedestrians don't know where to walk and crossover. It's a very dangerous area and recently someone was hit by a car. If a public sidewalk was added they would still have the space for what they were proposing.

Eve Mancuso informed the Board that she and Inspector Berrios were trying to breakdown the use of the space to determine parking demands and were trying to get an accurate picture of the full parking needs. The applicant seemed to be indicating parking needs on the basis of the building is all office, which it isn't. On the plan it shows the parking demand at 49 spaces and that's not making sense. Ms. Mancuso asked Mr. Yang if they were selling from the building.

Mr. Yang responded that they were not selling from the building and that their customer interaction is mainly online with a project usually taking 16 to 24 months to complete and at the end of the project the customer will sometimes come to the site to see the engineer test. Regular visitors are usually the auditors and they maybe have 1 or 2 per month.

Eve Mancuso asked what the square footage of the building was because the plans show them as 11,000 square feet and she believes that's an error.

Mr. Yang responded that the building is 60 X 95 and that is probably the lot size combined.

Ms. Mancuso questioned the size of the footprint of the building commenting that the architectural plan doesn't have dimensions so she doesn't have a scale to work with.

Mr. Yang responded that the footprint of the building is 6,500 sq. ft. for the first floor.

Ms. Mancuso explained that with those numbers given she was coming up with about 44 parking spaces necessary.

Mr. Yang continued to explain to the Board and Village Engineer the configuration of the existing first floor and proposed additional floors of the building, number of employees and the existing 9 parking spots.

Inspector Berrios informed Mr. Yang that the square footage of the building is what would determine the number of parking spaces necessary.

Dan Scaffidi asked Mr. Yang to explain his business again, which he did in great detail.

Mr. Perkins, representative for the applicant, arriving late to the meeting, explained to the Board again what the applicant was proposing for the building pointing out the various elevations of the building and where the extensions/addition will be.

Eve Mancuso explained to Mr. Perkins and the Board that there was a situation with the parking as there is a lot of exterior open space and the Village Building Code doesn't address this particular unique type of building as it is part warehouse and part office. This building is a hybrid of multiple building categories. If it is "office" the parking is 1 per 300 sq. ft. or 1 per 2 employees, if it's "warehousing" than parking is 1 per 300 sq. ft. or 1 per each employee, whichever is less. It's important to differentiate the square footage of each area.

Inspector Berrios informed the applicant what they needed to provide to him and the Planning Board which Mr. Yang agreed he would provide.

Attorney Michaels informed the applicant and Board that this would require a SEQR review.

Discussion between Board, Ms. Mancuso and Attorney Michaels as to next steps resulted in no further questions or comments regarding the project and the Board asked Attorney Michaels to draft the Resolution. Counselor Michaels drafted the following:

Motion to issue the Notice of Intention for the Planning Board to declare themselves Lead Agency on this project and to send it out to the other involved agencies, which for this matter is only the Zoning Board of Appeals.

RESOLUTION # 2 - 2022

As recited by legal counsel

Motion by: Joseph Coe

Seconded by: Bart Gordon

Roll Call:

Ed Molina - Yes

Diogenes Dominguez - Yes

Dan Scaffidi - Yes

Joseph Coe - Yes

Perry Masiello - Yes

Bart Gordon - Yes

Motion Carries: All

Chairman Molina entertained a motion to approve the Minutes of November 8, 2021 with typo corrections.

RESOLUTION # 3 - 2022

Motion by: Bart Gordon
Seconded by: Joseph Coe

Roll Call:

Ed Molina - Yes
Diogenes Dominguez - Yes
Dan Scaffidi - Yes
Joseph Coe - Yes
Perry Masiello - Yes
Bart Gordon - Yes

Motion Carries: All

Mr. Yang asked how long the process would take.

Attorney Michaels explained to the Board and Mr. Yang what the process would be through each meeting and he anticipates that the process may take several months, possibly into March, and then the applicant would go to the Zoning Board.

Chairman Molina: With no further business to be conducted by the Board, the Chairman entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

RESOLUTION # 4 - 2022

Motion by: Joseph Coe
Seconded by: Diogenes Dominguez
Motion Carries: All

Respectfully submitted by,
Judith Curcio

The Clerk Typist to the Planning Board of Appeals is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign these Minutes, and file a copy thereof in the office of the Village Clerk.


Gisbeth Ramos, Clerk Typist

