

VILLAGE OF CROTON ON HUDSON, NEW YORK
MINUTES OF THE WATERFRONT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Friday, March 30, 2012

A meeting of the Waterfront Advisory Committee of the Village of Croton-on-Hudson, New York was held on Friday, March 30, 2012 in the Municipal Building.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charlie Kane, Chairman
Ann Gallelli
Bruce Kauderer
Ian Murtaugh

ABSENT: Stuart Greenbaum

ALSO PRESENT: Daniel O'Connor, Village Engineer

1. Call to Order

Chairman Kane called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. OLD BUSINESS

Referral from Planning Board regarding application for an Amended Site Development Plan and Wetlands Activity Permit for new single-family dwelling—Steel Style Properties, LLC—50 Half Moon Bay Drive (Sec. 78.16 Blk. 1 Lot 3)—final consistency review

Mr. Mastromonaco, Consulting Engineer for the Applicant, presented the revised plans for the proposed dwelling and the changes to the application in response to the conditions that were stipulated in the preliminary determination of consistency, dated October 22, 2011.

The first condition referred to “public access and use of the municipal parking lot and trail adjacent to the proposed structure be maintained at current levels with no loss of parking opportunities or trail access by the public during or after construction.” Mr. Mastromonaco noted the following: 1) the applicant is using the parking lot as is their right via the easement, 2) if the village wants the gazebo they can take it and relocate it as long as it is 250 ft. away from the house, 3) during construction, there will not be any loss of parking, perhaps only temporary usage by tradesmen, 4) the upper and lower parking areas will be used to service the site as is permitted by the easements held by the applicant, 5) the construction will probably occur off-season, 6) the proposed plans significantly upgrade the trail on its property and extends it through the area owned by the village between its property and the parking lot.

The second condition states “that an easement through the municipal parking lot not be granted due to the potential for conflicts between public and private interests and possible reduced public parking opportunities.” Mr. Mastromonaco stated that the applicant already has a non-exclusive easement for the use of the parking lot, including for access to its property. The Applicant’s non-exclusive use of the parking lot for access through its property will not interfere at all with the public use of the lot for parking, which is limited to certain hours.

The third condition stipulates “that an independent engineering study be performed at the proposed site to determine the stability of the shoreline from the mean low water mark to the top of the slope, due to severe erosion of the shoreline by wind, wave and ice.” This condition was

met when the Village Engineer and Mr. Mastromonaco looked at the shoreline together and agreed to move the path back from the shore.

The fourth condition stipulates “that a detailed plan be developed to connect the relocated trail with the Riverwalk.” The Applicant provided a detailed plan which incorporates the comments of the Planning Board and the Village Engineer.

The fifth condition stated “that the proposed structure be reduced in height and bulk as appropriate so as not to diminish public viewsheds of the Hudson River and lands to the west from Half Moon Bay Drive or Elliot Way.” Mr. Mastromonaco pointed out that the Applicant has significantly reduced the height and bulk of the proposed single-family house. The peak elevation of the roof has been reduced by 6.3 ft. The photographic exhibits provided by the Applicant show that the house is 21.5 in zoning height.

There was a discussion concerning the removal of three trees. It was observed that their removal might actually improve the view especially in the summer. It was agreed however, that with the exception of the three trees on the applicant’s property, it was important to keep as many trees as possible.

Chairman Kane noted that the CAF has not changed since the preliminary determination of consistency. The policies were reviewed as follows:

Policy 9A: There was a discussion about the trail relocation and maintaining the trail during construction. Mr. Mastromonaco stated that there will be a continued use of the trail during construction.

Policy 11A: Ms. Gallelli noted that there is a sediment and erosion control policy in place for this application.

Policy 17A: This policy also concerns erosion. The applicant has placed a hedge, a nonstructural erosion control measure alongside the trail.

Policy 19: The committee noted that there is access to the trail since the four ft. wood railing has been removed.

Policy 19A: The applicant has provided handicap accessible ramp to the parking lot to provide access. The Village Engineer noted that the access is slightly changed but still maintained.

Policy 20: The proposed walkway provides access to the shoreline.

Policy 25: Chairman Kane stated that he believed the application was inconsistent with this policy (protecting viewsheds). Mr. Kauderer stated that he did not believe this view was an “identified viewshed.”

Policy 25A: Chairman Kane reiterated that he did not believe the application was consistent with this policy regarding protection of local scenic resources.

Policy 25D: Mr. Murtaugh noted that the viewsheds are not identified by the state or village, and therefore, this policy is moot.

Policies 33, 33A, 37, 37A 37B and 44A: These policies concern Best Management Practices to

which the applicant's plans adhere. The applicant includes methods to meet Best Management Practices which concern stormwater management, prevention of stormwater runoff, protection of wetlands from erosion, and adherence to standards and specifications as set forth in Best Management Practices.

Mr. Kauderer noted that the applicant has provided a significantly better plan. Ms. Gallelli noted that the proposed revised plan solves some of the issues as it concerns the WAC's purview. Mr. Murtaugh agreed that the plan had improved.

Mr. Kauderer made a motion that the WAC make a recommendation of a determination of consistency based on the submitted revised plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Murtaugh.

Chairman Kane reiterated that he believed that the proposed structure would block the view. He stated that Policies 25 and 25A were applicable and the proposed dwelling was inconsistent with these two policies.

A vote carried in favor of a recommendation of consistency by 3-1 (Chairman Kane opposed based on Policy 25 and Policy 25A). Mr. Geenbaum was absent.

4. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of February 16, 2012 were approved on a motion by Mr. Murtaugh, s seconded by Mr. Kauderer , carried by a vote of 4-0 with Mr. Greenbaum absent.

5. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was duly adjourned at 3:30 p.m on a motion by Mr. Murtaugh and seconded by Mr. Kauderer.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronnie Rose
WAC Secretary