

Minutes  
Meeting of the Planning Board  
Regular Session  
Village/Town of Mount Kisco  
Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Meeting called to order at 7:40 P.M. at the Municipal Building Mount Kisco, New York by Chairman Cosentino.

**Members Present:** Chairman Joseph Cosentino  
Vice Chairman Sturniolo  
Sol Gibbons  
Stanley Bernstein  
Ralph Vigliotti  
Doug Hertz

**Staff Present:** Anthony Oliveri  
Nanette Bourne  
Whitney Singleton  
Austin Cassidy

**Acceptance of Minutes**

September 27, 2011

**Motion:** Stanley Bernstein  
**Second:** Vice Chairman Sturniolo  
**Aye:** Sol Gibbons  
**Aye:** Ralph Vigliotti  
**Aye:** Stanley Bernstein  
**Aye:** Chairman Cosentino

**Conceptual Application**

**280 East Main Street LLC (American) – 280 Main Street**

*As there was no one from 280 East Main Street represented at this meeting, Chairman Cosentino requested Mr. Cassidy send out another violation (per Mr. Cassidy's decision).*

**Project Update Presentation**

**Northern Westchester Hospital – 400 Main Street**

**Present:**

**Douglas Winn Mayne, AIA - Associate, SLAM Collaborative**  
**David J. Vander Wal, R.E. - Walker Parking Consultants**  
**Michael Caruso, Vice President, Facilities - Northern Westchester Hospital Center**

Chairman Cosentino: Why don't you tell us what you need that is different from what is there now.

Michael Caruso: Doug will walk you through a PowerPoint presentation and show you the changes, and I'll highlight them for you. One change from the original plan that was submitted was the additional

Planning Board Regular Session  
October 11, 2011

geotechnical information and found out that the bedrock is much closer to the surface, which will wind up costing us a little bit more money. We had gotten a few costs estimates on the original parking structure that we submitted to you that were in excess of \$14,500,000, which was too expensive for us. So, we challenged our designers to come back, keeping the parameters that the Planning Board had set out for us and give us additional designs that maintain the same amount of cars and parking structure. As we walk through it, you will see there is an additional setback on St. Mark's Place. We felt that the Planning Board would be agreeable to that. We stayed within the height limits that were set out. Our intent is to hopefully get approval for footings and foundations, allowing us to pre-order our pre-cast materials. While we are doing that we can work through the logistics of the illumination details. Being cognizant of the resolution, we wanted to make sure we came back before and work that out. If we get approval for footings and foundations and get that piece going, we can, during that time, work through Nanette's office on all the illumination details. There are two slides that are attached here that speak to the lights and the height of the light poles on the upper deck. That was something we talked about a year and a half ago. You will see on the presentation light poles at 25 foot elevation. Obviously, the higher the light pole the fewer poles there are, the lower the light pole the more poles there are. That is portrayed in a few of these slides. Again, the type of fixtures that get attached to those poles is what I'm speaking about when we work through Nanette's or Anthony's office, to make sure they fall within the guidelines of the illumination standards.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: One of the things the resolution also contained was the encouragement of using LED lighting on the parking lot.

Michael Caruso: We certainly have been looking into all of that technology, and we have details on that. It's a different matter of how the light scatters to make sure we get the appropriate illumination. We will work with Nanette's office or we can come back here and talk to you about it. We can certainly talk to it a little this evening as we have a representative here from Walker Parking.

Nanette Bourne: When the applicant spoke to me several months ago, and I inquired as to the changes they were making, they really had some strategic decisions to make regarding the height and kind. I said it really was something they needed to bring to the Planning Board. I encouraged them, before they had footings and all the details, to come to you to lay it out so that the decision could be discussed with you and guided by you before it was made. The issue is whether they came submitting a full set of site plans. I said it's really premature, because the lighting, as Vice Chairman Sturniolo just said, is really a very key issue that was brought up with a lot of discussion and determined at a later time how it would be resolved.

Chairman Cosentino: We need to talk about that, because I don't want the lighting to hold up the footings.

Doug Hertz: I would like to know what is being proposed in its entirety.

Chairman Cosentino: We will know what is being proposed.

Douglas Mayne: The first batch of slides is for orientation. This is an overhead view. This slide is showing the impact of the Emergency Department as it stands right now. We have the addition itself, the loop road and some of the improvements that were made to the parking area to get the surface parking to work out. By extension, working within some of the boundaries of the establishment – the loop road and the entries for the new existing addition, which blossomed into the garage project as we get to this point in time. This is the footprint of a three bay parking garage which is accommodating the 457 cars that we agreed to last time. Accompanying the future garage project which is now upon us is also a landscaping effort which is similar to some of the efforts we brought to the Emergency Department and parts of the campus at large. This is a graphic representation of it here. We had a cad file which we had gone through with the town, which is a more detailed version of the plantings plan for the particulars of this landscaping effort here which is all to buffer the effect of the garage and take advantage of the setback off St. Mark's Place.

Doug Hertz: Is this an entirely new plan and not the plan that was presented to us originally?

Douglas Mayne: This is a very close cousin to what you saw before. Actually, you're seeing a lot of repeat slides and we are going to try to highlight some of the construction realities that we have encountered and show you what the differences are.

Doug Hertz: What you're showing us here, with the parking garages and setbacks; this is a new proposal?

Douglas Mayne: Correct.

Michael Caruso: This is the same footprint and same height as the garage that was previously approved. That has not changed.

Doug Hertz: What has changed?

Douglas Mayne: The construction and engineering relative to the pre-cast effort. The plan is very similar to what you saw before. Here are the floor plans themselves, which we are going to work from bottom to top. This is the beginning of the entry off St. Mark's Place and this is the slot of parking which represent the 60 that we agreed to accommodate for the retail building at the corner. That works itself out until we get to a point where we develop 60 and then convert the balance of the garage for the hospital use. This represents a typical deck, but this is the first of our "between grade" decks. This deck is one level above where we just came in off St. Marks and also one level below where we would enter the garage from the hospital side. This shows a full complement of what you get with the three bays of the pre-cast construction. This looks very similar, but the difference here is that this is the entry level for the hospital and two levels about that retail St. Mark's entry point. You can also see, going up with the floor plans here, the core, which has a stair and elevator, which would serve the traffic going into the hospital. We have an emergency egress in the corner. When we get up to the top deck, which from the hospital side is one story above the grade level. In this corner is that two-story condition that we looked at with some of the balloon trials that

we did. Again, the footprint is virtually identical. We're talking two or three inches in changes trying to get the pre-cast to work towards the detailing that we need to accomplish so the floor plan is essentially the same as what you saw before. The heights are still the same as what we had discussed last time. In getting into now the appearance of the garage, these are the four basic elevations of the little bit of the landscaping so we can get a feel of how it relates to the street. This is a view of Main Street with the shops in front with the garage back behind as it's perched up on top of the hill which exists up there. Again, that is quite a distance off the street, so it would not actually appear as this elevation shows, but it gives you a feel of the size of the project relative to the shops and the new Emergency Department which is over here, which is now completed. This elevation faces the Emergency Department. This is the narrow end of the garage, which is oriented towards the houses. This is the elevation which runs along St. Mark's. Again, some of the critical points that we measured before and tested out in the site work are relevant to the big view we get from the corner of St. Mark's, which we were all concerned about. As a function of trying to put the project on a diet from our standpoint and also to try to accommodate the mechanics of the garage, we tried to avoid having mechanically ventilated decks. We wanted it to be an open-air garage. What ended up happening is kind of a harmonic convergence, if you will. If we were to pull the intermediate tiers that we had introduced as a element to the garage, that would help to reduce dollars and also have the benefit of giving us enough free area around the perimeter of the parking deck so we can avoid having to mechanically exhaust the parking decks, which is just a good thing to do in and of itself.

Michael Caruso: Just removing those spandrels and creating regular size spandrels saved \$400,000 alone.

Douglas Mayne: We also got the area that enables us to avoid the mechanical exhaust, which is another expense.

Chairman Cosentino: Is this what changes the design of the building in some way?

Michael Caruso: Yes.

Chairman Cosentino: Didn't you have to go before the Architectural Review Board originally?

Douglas Mayne: We wanted to get your take on that in terms of what would trigger that.

Chairman Cosentino: This Board has no authority to change what they already approved. If you are changing a design, you need to go before them again.

Michael Caruso: Agreed.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: Do you have a before and after slide of what the original approval looked like?

*Mr. Mayne then illustrated the before and after slides.*

Douglas Mayne: This presentation looks very much identical to the one you had seen before. We went through a pretty good effort trying to keep things consistent with what had been approved while trying to address some of these other concerns. This is an aerial view from the corner of St. Mark's Place.

Ralph Vigliotti: Are you creating the berm on the lower parking lot behind the retail or are you carving out?

Douglas Mayne: It's a carve out. The street profile will stay the same. The planting buffer follows the profile of the street. This is the two setbacks. One is a building setback and one is a parking set back, and the building is very close; I believe 18 inches, which gives you something up to 60 plus feet from the street edge to where the building will be. These sketches don't really represent the landscaping area, but that distance gives us a real nice landscaping benefit.

Ralph Vigliotti: Would a mix of hardwood and softwood trees provide a little bit more coverage to camouflage the building from the neighborhood? I would like that to be considered somewhere along the line.

Douglas Mayne: I don't know what the percentage is off-hand, but it is not regimented. It's a much more natural landscape with a bigger mix than I'm suggesting. There are three or four species of tree there in addition to some of the shrubbery.

Douglas Mayne: Trying to preserve what we had last time was a main goal, and in some ways having the exercise of getting to the reality of building this has cleaned up the design to some degree. I think it is going to be as nice as the other one, maybe a little less fussy to some extent. Here is another set, farther up on St. Mark's Place looking at the before and after. One of the things you will notice in this slide is the way we are trying to generate some of that openness for that one submerged deck so we don't have to incur the penalty of the mechanical ventilation.

David Vander Wal: It also improves the paths of security for staff to be able to see outside. We are trying to get it so you can always see daylight on every floor.

Chairman Cosentino: How high is the wall on the top floor? I realize you're not going to be able to see anything from the street.

Douglas Mayne: It goes 42 inches above the parking surface.

Chairman Cosentino: You shouldn't be able to see any vehicles from the street, then.

Douglas Mayne: You can see the tops of the cars; otherwise you don't see the cars.

David Vander Wal: You will see the top portion of SUV's and trucks, particularly if a van backs up to an outside wall, which is normally discouraged. That will show up the most.

Douglas Mayne: These “before and after” are really revolved around what Mr. Caruso is talking about in terms of what we had to do to address budget and mechanical changes.

Chairman Cosentino: Please think about designating an area for vans, not being on the top floor.

Michael Caruso: We will certainly try to do that.

Douglas Mayne: There are some specialty spots which are on the ground level entry into the garage.

Ralph Vigliotti: I know this is trimming back and cost saving on your part, but with the original there was an appearance on first blink, first blush of an office building. With the modifications it now looks like a garage. I know you are trying to save money, but if you can go back to that appearance of possibly an office building, which I think we were trying to achieve at some point. We are now looking at the austerity budget parking garage. Whatever it’s worth, I do share that with you.

Douglas Mayne: It’s definitely not the austerity garage. Some of the critical things with the design of the garage are having the brick veneer. Looking at some of the particulars of the tier design and some of the profiles we have, which help tie the architecture in with the Emergency Department that we just completed. We want to have that all be part of a very similar architectural language, which we think would help to give it a very pleasant look.

Michael Caruso: Those spandrels are \$450,000. If they were 25, 30 even \$100,000 I think we would certainly would have put that on the table. At this point, that is a significant amount of money for a non-profit. Again, we do not have the opportunity to raise money for a parking structure because not many people want to donate to that. We were struggling on what we needed to do. We will certainly look at what it is that we can possibly put back or remove.

Chairman Cosentino: What would the cost be to just put those towards Main Street?

Michael Caruso: We can certainly look at that. We also have to make sure it still maintains an “open-air” type of concept.

David Vander Wal: Part of what we’re fighting is, in order to get “openness,” we are actually having to pull that hillside further back away from the deck. With the strip down, to get to the 20 percent open area and 40 percent linear, we needed to pull that hillside ten feet away from the deck. We’ve gone around the west and south sides and pulled it more on the east side in order to get there. To do it just on this elevation we probably could do it. We certainly cannot do it on the cemetery side and Main Street. A number of these are hidden behind the rock pile.

Douglas Mayne: We were surprised how much we had to remove to get the “openness” that we needed to achieve to get the percentages. We were much under that than we expected to be, I guess, before we got into the particulars of the design, especially the mechanical exhaust, and that was a bit of an eye-opener for us. So was the need to get that open air requirements, which seemed to be the best thing

to address in terms of trying to look at a version which would set us at a high level.

Michael Caruso: We will go back to pre-casting and see if we can get that accommodated as much as we can.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: Does the "openness" concept have much of an impact on blowing snow into the garage, and if it does, how does it dial into your plans as far as removal, storage, etc.

Michael Caruso: Certainly we've been looking at. If it's totally open, even at that level, you're still going to have snow blowing in. We are preparing for that as well, when that time comes. Obviously we have to change the way we do snow removal and things such as that. We will have to cart a lot of it off site.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: But that is something you are prepared for and can deal with?

Michael Caruso: Yes, absolutely.

David Vander Wal: Normally what happens with the blowing snow is the cover tiers are actually getting more snow from cars driving in. There will be the occasional odd storm where you get some accumulation. Most of the snow accumulation would actually be on the side away from the wind, the spandrels - just where the snow would go out of the deck is where you'll see any accumulation. I've seen a foot and a half, two feet of snow come on the top tier and it's not enough in general to have to deal with on the cover tiers because it's hard to get that much to accumulate over the area. What snow that does come in, the car motors are warming up and they in part melt what comes underneath.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: I am not raising it from an argumentative point of view with the presentation, but from your operational point of view and your financial considerations. You've obviously already thought of.

David Vander Wal: You'll plow the corners and bobcat the snow over the sides and haul it off site.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: Thank you.

Stanley Bernstein: On the same subject of blowing snow and an open atmosphere, in order to have mechanical ventilation you must be aware that you will not have complete ventilation of the open area. There is going to be residual carbon monoxide. There have been a few projects that I've been on, the Port Authority Bus Terminal in Manhattan, for example, where it was overwhelming without mechanical ventilation, even though all the walls were open and the spandrels were out. That has to be taken into consideration as well as the snow. You can't rely on wind coming from one corner all the time. You will get inversions, blockages of wind from one direction and another, and you will not get perfect ventilation, even though it is open. That is a costly consideration you are going to have to give it.

David Vander Wal: I am not aware of an open parking structure in the country that's had to install ventilation when it's been built. The key is

the 40 percent distribution over the linear and the sides. The nice thing with this is that we have the better part of three sides ventilated.

Stanley Bernstein: You may be correct in what you say. In the winter when a great number of cars are idling to warm up, depending upon which way the wind is blowing and what kind of inversion there is, there is a strong possibility that you're going to get a high concentration of dangerous gases within that space without mechanical ventilation. I know there are no garages that do mechanical ventilation. I wanted to point out the fact that by taking down the spandrels, it's not all rosy. I think it behooves you to get the mechanical engineer to look at that very closely and run some numbers. You will find there are some periods of time where you're going to get some pretty bad air in there.

Michael Caruso: We will certainly do that. Also, vehicles are being made more efficiently these days; it should make it a little better.

Ralph Vigliotti: I can certainly appreciate your budget, but if you would put your hat on as a Mount Kisco resident for a second, this is our first parking structure. The hospital has been a wonderful neighbor. When all is said and done, I hate for the people of the village to say, "Look what the hospital put up." By saving \$400,000, and, again, I can appreciate the cost savings, perhaps you may end up building that just does not meet up to the standards to the rest of the hospital and community at large. I want to leave that with you.

Michael Caruso: We have considered that. With the way the Emergency Room came out is indicative of the work we do, and the careful consideration we do take for the Village of Mount Kisco. This is going to mirror it to a point. Eliminating the spandrel is about \$400,000 or \$450,000. The rest of the garage is a total of about a million or a million and a half dollars that we've saved on this. This make is affordable for us to at least try to construct. The other thing we have against us is that this whole time that we are reviewing this, we are transporting our staff back and forth from Chappaqua, and that is in excess of \$600,000 per year. As you add that up, it just keeps compounding it. We are being considerate of the Village of Mount Kisco, but we are looking to try and get this sooner than later.

Doug Hertz: We would have been happy to have you build it first. I think that was our request. But, it was your staging plan to bring it in when it was.

Michael Caruso: That's true.

Douglas Mayne: To continue, the next couple of slides are the lead in to the lighting project. I think what Mike was saying before was that LED vs. the whole height vs. the distribution on the decks is a lot of variables. It is best that we work with the town directly to hone in the best solution. From an aesthetic standpoint, these two slides will show what we have introduced and what the two choices are in terms of the pole amount and pole height and the impact from our view here from St. Mark's Place. This first one is the shorter pole heights and the quantity and distribution that we would need to be able to achieve for the lighting levels that we would have to hit from a code standpoint with the lighting levels we are talking about with the village. With the shorter light standards you'd need 24, and with the taller – and again



it's just the way the spread of the light from the fixtures would work – you would have fewer but taller. Those are, from an aesthetic standpoint, the basic differences from the physical light fixture itself. But then all the photometrics involved with the options for the particular heads on these two options is another whole matrix of options that we need to evaluate and hone in on. Again, LED's would be a nice thing to zero in on. It's really the right way to go these days. But again, this is a before and after and these are options. The shorter, higher quantity approach, the taller, lesser quantity and the impact you get from the street. It makes for an interesting sort of difference. To conclude, in terms of our standpoint to what we've been delivering as far as the Emergency Department goes, we really hold very tight to what you saw during the design process. I think everything panned out quite well as far as the Emergency Department.

### **Presentation Concluded**

Doug Hertz: I've been waiting awhile to see this plan. We all knew this was an unsolved issue, and it had a lot of ramifications. I think we wisely put this off because we knew technology was moving and there were things that would be discovered. First, I am pleased that you did not change the height of the building because of what you ran into. I think the physical changes to the facades are quite frankly something that, while I like the detail of the prior version, I understand where you are with your funding. I am going to leave some of that to the ARB, because, quite frankly, I think it's really their purview to go over architectural details when it comes to how the façade gets treated and how they feel it ties into the building you just built. The areas I want to talk about are specifically about lighting, but they are really much broader than that. I think we are seeing a major change at the moment in vehicle technology and what we're going to expect out of that structure for decades to come. One of the major things we will be seeing is electric vehicles, and I think we will be seeing them in very large volumes. I think it would behoove the hospital to consider in the planning of this structure – a car structure is the perfect place to do vehicle charging.

Michael Caruso: We have already considered it, and it is part of this plan to have a charging station for at least six to eight vehicles.

Doug Hertz: I would ask you to consider opening up your future infrastructure of that to make it accessible enough so when you discover that 150 of those vehicles are electric, in eight years from now, that you can accommodate those.

David Vander Wal: We can accommodate it much more than the power company can.

Doug Hertz: I will bring in the rest to the second part of the discussion.

David Vander Wal: That has been more of a challenge. Accommodating charging stations in between the vehicles is -----  
---. Trying to get a letter of service from the power company to provide the extra wattage is a challenge.

Doug Hertz: I'm not suggesting that you build something now and encumber yourselves at this point, until the demand gets there. And I

use that word, as an engineer, a little bit loosely. I anticipate this is going to be a significant thing. In my business, this is going to be a major trend for home building. We are seeing this on a constant basis. I think anticipating that and anticipating having infrastructure; whether it be conduit pulls or something else where you are going to be able to bring in the extra power, I'd like you to be able to accommodate that. The second part of this has to do with lighting, and this ties in very closely. The lighting code of the village wisely limited the heights of lighting poles for parking lots. This is probably one of the more sensitive spots where the code is going to come into play. You are dealing with a raised structure. That scene from St. Marks and from Main Street is from a much lower elevation than a typical parking lot. You're adding 20-30 feet to the base level of all these light bulbs. One of the things I've seen over the past few years is that there is an interesting back-door solution to all this. We've seen parking lots to solar canopies. Not that solar is interesting to do, but canopies are what are really intriguing. Because the minute you build a metal structure to cover part of your parking, you build a very easy place to hang all your lighting. So you no longer have to build in light poles and the cost of all that – you're already there.

David Vander Wal: As long as you don't mind an extra eight to ten feet on the structure, it works very well. And we are designing a lot of structures with the metallic on the roof. There are paybacks, and it's a very viable solution. The key is it's going to look like you have another story on the building. The hospital has expressed interest in it, but the concern is really from a planning standpoint. Can you get approval for the extra structure that needs to go up? We are doing work at William Patterson University. All over the campus, there is hardly a parking spot that doesn't have PB panels above. That does give you a perfect spot to put your light. Now your light is going to be eight to ten feet above the floor, probably seven to eight feet above the floor.

Doug Hertz: This has not been a discussion of this board. This is the first time I throw this upon you and the Board at the same time. In my view, what is the cost benefit analysis and forgetting for a moment the cost of putting in these things, which is significant and burdening the hospital with that. For me, we are dealing with two things; your view of the 25 foot light poles, to me is onerous, because the one part of the equation you left out is when they are fewer and higher, they're brighter.

David Vander Wal: A little bit, but not a lot.

Doug Hertz: I'm sorry, I've done enough physics. When you move light farther away, light falls off in the inverse square, you're not going to get brighter. There is really no two ways about it.

David Vander Wal: Actually it goes darker. The distance increases because I've just moved my pole 60 feet further away from the individuals. If you go back to the plan Mr. Mayne has, with the lower poles, I have a light pole on every column in order to drop it 15 feet. I've got 28 poles to go down the 15 foot. What I don't like about it, is the parapet is 22 feet above the street. Now, the pole is another 15, so I'm 37 feet up. I'm only 60 feet away. If I go to move the pole 60 feet further from the edge of the property, now the light pole, instead of being 60 feet away from the property and the pole is 39 feet up. If I move it 120 feet from the property line, you have six poles and 12

light sources instead of 28 light sources. We cut the number of light sources roughly in half, we moved the light sources 48 to 60 feet away from the edge of the structure and we go up. The solution that seem to work best which I've been going back and forth with, and we need some guidance from the Board before we go through the details with Engineering, is doing a gullwing fixture that goes out about 10 feet from the center poles. With the 10 or 15 foot arm, the longest arm we could get, staying with those six center poles, doing the arms that bring it out, I could bring the height down four feet, but I still stay with those six light pole locations in the center of the structure. I really think that becomes the best balance. I don't like structures with the light pole on the outside wall. We can do it either way and it's not a big cost difference, but we're going to need some guidance from the Board. My recommendation for you for a parking structure is to go with fewer poles and say there are no poles on the outside of the structure. I think you'll get a better lighting for the top. If you want them only 15 feet above the top tier, we can do that, but I don't think the town would be as happy with that light so close to the perimeter.

Doug Hertz: I hear your point, but I don't agree. When you have to light from an interior space, you have to point the light towards the exterior. It may not be brighter, but it's certainly more visible. People generally object to the brightness, or being able to look into the face of a luminary. When you're lighting from the perimeter pointing in, it's a lot easier to shield that than it is when you're lighting from the center pointing out.

David Vander Wal: It's a flat glass fixture, either way. Your reflectors are both horizontal. You want a recessed fixture, correct?

Michael Caruso: Yes.

David Vander Wal: So we have to keep a recessed fixture, either way.

Doug Hertz: I'd like to go back to having you and the Board consider another solution. If you did some sort of covered or semi-covered structure up there, it would provide one, a place to mount lighting; two, it would give you a shielding for most of that lighting; and three, it would allow you not to have maintenance on that upper area. You would not be plowing that upper area. It would be a more pleasant experience on your upper roof. The detriment to that is that we have to decide if the visual aspect of seeing if an open covered structure is better or worse than seeing open spotlights.

Chairman Cosentino: They also have to be approved by the Architectural Review Board.

Michael Caruso: We also have to consider the cost of everything. We have considered making sure the upper deck is structurally sound. We are making sure that we have columns that are thick enough that we can install it later on. We certainly want to consider everything we can consider for the long term. We have to look into that at least to make sure the columns can support it.

Doug Hertz: The minute you put PV up on there, afterwards you are just taking down your 25 foot poles anyway. They somehow don't go through solid things too well. I would ask you to do a radical re-thinking of what this structure is. Because I am very concerned what

a 25 foot pole on top of a 20-30 foot elevation is going to look like. These bright poles are going to be the high spot of the hospital, and you will see them from Main Street and St. Mark's Place, whether they're 15 feet or 25 feet. I personally think its less onerous to see more and lower that are more easily shielded. I think there are better solutions out there, and one of the great advantages of PV is that you might be able to get an outside company to pay for the structure.

Michael Caruso: It's not that high right now for them to come and pay for it. We're thinking in a few years, there would certainly be more acceptance for that as that technology grows.

David Vander Wal: The PV I've seen go in structures is over parking stalls, not over the full 60 feet.

Doug Hertz: But you've got parking stalls over two-thirds of it.

David Vander Wal: If we go with the PV, we can with a light fixture that modeled the PV framework. So that is lower than anything else we can do. We will have the architectural impact of the PV.

Doug Hertz: In any rate, I offer that up as something to think about. Those are two things I think the hospital should strongly consider. The first one being providing for, if not current, future need for vehicle charging and the infrastructure should be able to expand upon that in the future; the second being, looking at if a covered structure for that parking lot is a better option then exposed lighting.

Stanley Bernstein: You have the stylized contour lines all over the place. On the St. Mark's Place contour, there are horizontal straight contour lines. Is that possibly stairs?

Douglas Mayne: That is a steep berm.

Ralph Vigliotti: I agree with Mr. Hertz with regard to adding additional charging stations, or at least planning the conduits to service them in the future. I'm not really in favor of adding any kind of structure that is going to make the existing plan any higher to house lighting. I think we need to address the lighting that you have shared with us and work that through. I do not want to see another story of lights in that neighborhood.

Sol Gibbons: The finish of the building is the purview of the ARB and not this Board, and the lighting will have to be discussed separately.

Austin Cassidy: The upper deck open air portions where the ----- would be, how do you foresee usage? Is that anybody parking there at all times?

Michael Caruso: There is a potential for that. We have not gone into details for that yet. It could be physician's parking, visitors, etc. There is potential to do it all by control access gates.

Austin Cassidy: That raises the question if the lights have to be on all night or not.

David Vander Wal: We have to keep a certain minimal level of lighting on both the top deck and the covered deck, but we have the ability to

lower the lighting levels with occupancy sensors, particularly on the covered tiers. On the covered tiers, I'd really like to go with an LED fixture. I don't see anything from the hospital's standpoint that is going to prevent us from doing it. Technically those fixtures are not well-shielded, but they are far enough in from the perimeter so we're okay on the shielding. The problem I have now looking at LED's is the shielding for the fixtures just isn't there to control light scope from the top to your fixture to an LED at the property line. I like the LED on the roof, but I don't have as much control for being able to mask it and keep the lights off the top tier. They are changing and getting better. Certainly our options today are much better than they were two years ago, and we are getting to the point where we are using LED maybe one-third to half the time on covered tiers. Certainly elsewhere in the county we are going ahead with the LED on covered tiers, but with the light ordinances in the towns, we are staying with the traditional metal light because of the ability to mask the light and control the light spill at the property line.

Douglas Mayne: Relative to the setback, there is the technology available to be able to set back the lighting levels based on occupancy.

David Vander Wal: At Morgan-Stanley, when they took over the old Texaco, we were able to do a step-down with ----- fixtures on top, and I think that would be appropriate here. The difficulty is that you would really like to have visitor parking on the covered tier because of the high turnover mostly and it's close to the hospital entrance. So, in reality, there will probably be staff on the top tier and lowest level during the daytime. We can preserve that parking. I don't know if we'll be able to keep the top tier totally empty, but even if we did theoretically keep it empty, we still have to keep a security level lighting from an operational/liability standpoint. I think the step down would be to minimize parking up there and go to the lower level of parking for the middle of the night. Certainly this time of year when it begins to get dark by 5 P.M., we will need everything we have on the top tier.

Austin Cassidy: You can control usage in the evening lighting, from the beginning of darkness until the third shift comes on. At that point, most of the public is off the premises. The third shift is not going to want to park on the roof, particularly if it's snowing. They are going to want to park where it's secure and safe and the shortest route to the building. You could cut back unnecessary lighting on the roof, at the very least and cut down impacts on a time basis.

David Vander Wal: That's why I think we can go to step-down. We have to meet the code minimum.

Chairman Cosentino: I am sure the lighting is going to take awhile. Do you foresee doing footings first? Is the lighting going to hold the process up? I need to know that.

Michael Caruso: We would certainly like to do the footings and foundations first.

David Vander Wal: Top tier lighting is not going to impact the foundations. We have conduit that has to go in. We can design the footings, assuming the light poles are the worst case scenario. The

amount of over designs for the footings is not enough to worry about. We can cover the worst case scenarios for lighting.

Chairman Cosentino: Mr. Hertz, in all due respect, because you have a lot of knowledge in lighting, such as Vice Chairman Sturniolo, this Board worked long and hard to keep that structure low. We were on a site visit where we said we wanted the back part of the building to be low. Even though your idea may be good, I am totally, totally against it. I do not want to see a higher structure on that building. I am going to appoint Vice Chairman Sturniolo to work with your lighting people and I will work along with him and report back to the Board. We will bring Mr. Hertz in on the meetings, he can come to whichever he chooses to look at this and bring it back. I want to separate the footings from the lighting. I do not want the lighting to hold up your progress in doing the footings.

Doug Hertz: With all due respect, this approval was two years ago. This has been discussed for four years. Rushing something at the last minute, where we have had this time to discuss it, makes no sense whatsoever.

Chairman Cosentino: What part of it does not make sense? The lighting is an apple, the footing is an orange.

Doug Hertz: If nothing that we are going to decide at the end impacts them, if they can design their footings and pre-casting for all conceivable options, I could care less. They could build it yesterday.

Chairman Cosentino: Are you saying they should not build the structure if we don't get the lighting plan settled?

Doug Hertz: No. I know we are going to come to a decision because we have to come to a decision.

Chairman Cosentino: So what does one have to do with the other? They want to start in the spring. I don't know how long this lighting is going to take? Do we stop progress in the spring just for the sake of the lighting?

Doug Hertz: No, I'm happy to begin. I'll say it again, I'm happy to have them build whatever they want to build, but I'm not going to change the decision on a design thing at the last minute because they built it wrong. If this Board decides that we want it lit from wherever it may be, and they have already put in their building, it's going to be on them that they have made this decision to move ahead without all the parts having been put in place. We've had years to do this. Coming back at this point and saying, "we're in a rush," does not fly with me. I love the hospital and I think everything that has gone on with this construction has been spectacular.

Chairman Cosentino: Am I not mistaken that this was approved already?

Austin Cassidy: Not to the ultimate end. They were due to come back.

Doug Hertz: I don't know that we are arguing, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Cosentino: No, we are not. I am just declaring that I don't want to hold their progress up.

Austin Cassidy: As far as footings are concerned, the materials and design change is more directly affecting whatever their footing design is going to be by the lampposts. The only thing that would have potential for a significant impact is if you were designing an additional plane to remove a roof of some kind. That would have construction load to that as well. But snow load on the roof or snow load on the parking deck is still the same snow load. So, whether or not there is some kind of covering over the whole thing or not, could affect footing design. Primarily the critical shift here in design and materials is going to have more of an impact. So the Architectural Review Board is a player on the design and materials aspect. Footings are just nuts and bolts to what has been designed.

Chairman Cosentino: I just can't put the two together. The only way I see the two going together is – "Hey, you didn't finish your lighting, so now I'm not going to give you permission to pour the concrete." I don't see it.

Ralph Vigliotti: From what we heard, even when the footings and foundation are put into place, the design for that upper deck will accommodate both types of lighting, whether it be the high lights or the lower lights. I think we have a "win" right now. I would go along with the chair that the footings and foundation can certainly take place and the lighting to be accommodated by the subcommittee we put into place. The "higher poles, lower poles" situation can be accommodated at a later point. Is that correct?

David Vander Wal: Exactly.

Ralph Vigliotti: So then it sounds like we'll be okay.

Chairman Cosentino: Ms. Bourne will be working with them as well, so I think we have a good group here that can solve the problem.

David Vander Wal: We have a few technical details that the group you are talking about could readily address and come back to the full board and get their concurrence. We need direction from you more than anything.

Chairman Cosentino: You now have to go before the Architectural Review Board.

Austin Cassidy: It is important you go before them now to stabilize the proposed aesthetic and design sheet.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: If we can go back, I don't want to sound inquisitive to your budgetary process, but if the removal of the mechanical exhaust system is \$450,000 and you said you're looking to shave off a million point something overall, please repeat where the difference between the 450 and the balance is saved.

Michael Caruso: You have 450 with the spandrels, which does not include the mechanical ventilation and the additional sprinkler that is required, if it comes to a less of an open air. I don't even know what that number is. Then you have reduced rock excavation and blasting

that is going to be required. That came back with it's entire reduction of one million five.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: The excavation is tied in to the architectural look of removing those panels?

Michael Caruso: No. The excavation is what you don't see. In order to accommodate the retail in the earlier design, we have a lot more parking.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: So it's a separate issue from the removal?

Michael Caruso: Correct.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: I totally agree with you about LED having some questionable aspects regarding light shielding. A lot of this conversation boils down to two things. One, the additional height above the top deck no matter how it's done. But there is also the other issue of the glow of a night sky, and how best to reduce that, regardless of the tallness of the pole or no pole at all. Going with the covered structure idea with lights inside hanging down below, obviously addresses the night sky very well. I remember when we spoke about this the last time we talked about how well you can utilize current LED technology to place lights within the inside walls of the top deck to flood the driveway area with sufficient lighting to hopefully impact what you need to do regarding going up. I'm not looking for a hard answer tonight, but I think it's another seed that we have all been trying to plant.

David Vander Wal: I have an award winning, nationally recognized project at Williams College. There is a beautiful parking deck and on one side of the top tier of the parking deck we have an architectural feature we could hide the lighting in. On the other side we went with lights between the parked vehicles. I was there about 6:00 one evening and I would not want to park on that top tier. I could not see to put the keys in my car because it's so difficult to get cars parked such that I can light that channel between the two cars. That is the one structure in 26 years that we actually tried to do wall-mounted lighting on. It's what the owner wanted and that's what they got, but it's a very difficult technology.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: I'm not talking about individual wall-mounted fixtures. I'm talking about a band or a ribbon; a continuous band of lighting at different levels on the wall. I don't know if three could be accomplished or two, but something to get more light on that deck other than using poles. That is what I would like to see explored.

David Vander Wal: I have yet to see a fixture that can do that, that can also take vehicular impact and the variability of car parking. I have not seen a solution and I've asked every vendor that's come in what they're after, because I knew this was coming up at some point. The good news is that we've come a long way in the LED technology for the covered tiers, but what I've seen is still something that is trying to get a light from overhead and spreader. We are getting to the point where we are getting good patterns and a distribution in the LED now that is controlling the light's direction. The irony is that the little lamps themselves are built in mini-reflectors, but still not at the level of shielding that we can get out of the older generation fixtures.



Doug Hertz: To pick up on Vice Chairman Sturniolo's idea, what about a combination of the two using some exterior wall-mounted lighting in combination with some pole-mounted fixtures.

Douglas Mayne: The wall lighting is going to be the inherent problem of the cars blocking the lighting. It's always going to depend on whether there are cars there or someone parked in the right spot or not. I will be a challenge trying to keep it something below car length.

Michael Caruso: For safety reasons, we will have to anticipate and overcome that.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: If you have a concern about a bumper hitting it, there is a simple way to protect it. I don't mean to challenge your expertise in the field, but by the same token I'd like to challenge it and investigate what we were just talking about with those lighting fixtures.

Douglas Mayne: We are going to do it together, which is the best way to bring it home. There are a lot of variables, some tangibles and I think we have to just put our heads together and decide what the best options are going to be for it.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: From one Planning Board member's point of view, from day one I have viewed the hospital project with the multiple phases as something that is not a corporate endeavor where XYZ Company is here in Mount Kisco and they want to expand and expand their financial database. I think there needs to be some give and take on this Board's part, because of what and who the applicant is and most importantly what the applicant does to not just Mount Kisco but for all of Northern Westchester. I am willing to accommodate and work (and I'm sure I'm speaking for everyone here at this table) with the hospital. This is an important endeavor. I believe in this hospital as a big contributor and an important necessity and partnership in the community. Everybody in this room has to make this work.

Douglas Mayne: With all due respect, I believe this is going to set a precedent in Mount Kisco. If we do this project right it will set the bar at a very high level for the next garage in town.

Vice Chairman Sturniolo: Absolutely. You've already set that bar high with the Emergency Department, the new driveway entrance, and the fact that you've got somewhere around 26 individual patient rooms in the Emergency Department right now. It's a showcase, and you've got to be proud of it. I believe you are going along in that proud path.

Anthony Oliveri: Before we wrap things up, speaking in terms of what was approved and what this shows now on the site plan, particularly the cut back around the garage. That is going to need to be updated on the site plan, so we will need an amended site plan or an update to the site plan. I'm not sure it is the intention of the applicant to come back to the Board after meeting with the ARB with an amended site plan. Either way, we are going to need to reflect that on the site plan.

Nanette Bourne: I think it's more than just the light issue.

Chairman Cosentino: Please sit down with them and work with them for everything that needs to be done.

Anthony Oliveri: How is the cutback handled? Is it a wall or just a stabilized slope, how is the drainage going to be handled?

Whitney Singleton: We need clarification here. We were of the impression, as written in the agenda, that this was an update for the board of the status of what is going on at the site, not whether site plan alterations are being authorized here.

Chairman Cosentino: I don't think the Board had any problems with site plan alterations. There wasn't much of a change. If the site plan itself has to be changed, you three people (Mr. Singleton, Mr. Oliveri and Ms. Bourne) are going to have to be involved in it and do what you have to do to get it changed.

Nanette Bourne: The point is that if there was a direction in which they could go ahead and start the footings, they need to have their site plan modified and approved by the Board before.

Michael Caruso: So we will go before the Architectural Review Board and speak to them about the change to the façade and while we are doing that, you can work on the changes to update the site plan. Is that acceptable?

Chairman Cosentino: Yes.

Anthony Oliveri: The ARB is going to govern whether or not you're doing this. If they don't like this whole idea and you go back to the stanchions, then you're not cutting back the slope, either. This is worst case scenario.

Michael Caruso: This is strictly a financial burden on the hospital, and that is what we are trying to do. Hopefully they will understand that we will make it as architecturally pleasing as possible. Again, almost 15 million dollars for a parking structure today is very difficult in today's economy for a non-profit.

Anthony Oliveri: Either way, an amendment to the site plan has to be reviewed and approved by the board.

Nanette Bourne: If you should get a read from the ARB first, come back for the revised modification to your site plan.

Austin Cassidy: I'd like to get the protocol straightened out, because you have a very specific phasing and that being of this project and its various phases. Now we're off that, and we're off it with some modifications to some of the documents that we will need, ultimately, your approval for those modifications. So, projecting out, you've got a special committee that you just made for the lighting, but I can't sign off on a building plan for lighting if I don't have an approval from the Board what the lighting plan is. They are going to be going to the Architectural Review Board, which will be November, on the assumption that it is a one-night visit. It might not be. It might be November and December. Then, when they clear that forum, the committee would have been working on the lighting question, and parallel there are going to be modifications to the approved site plan of

record that you need to review and approve. So the target is for them to be coming back here in January?

Chairman Cosentino: Whenever they do their homework, they can come back.

Austin Cassidy: When that is approved and I get construction drawings, then they can get a building permit and off they go starting footings.

Chairman Cosentino: That will probably not be done until the spring.

Whitney Singleton: Is there any aspect which has not been discussed tonight that has been changed from this plan?

David Vander Wal: We reduced the parking count. We still meet the resolution. We were trying to get more spaces than that previously.

Chairman Cosentino: But they were not reduced.

Whitney Singleton: 457 spaces are still being achieved, correct?

David Vander Wal: Correct. We are still meeting the resolution. We were looking to be over the resolution, but we had to eliminate the over.

Whitney Singleton: Yes, because your numbers don't add up on your plans. Have all aspects of Phase I been completed? Landscape, lighting, etc.?

Michael Caruso: Everything has been completed. There were some questions from Nanette's office regarding the lighting that is up to the interpretation of the illumination guidelines, where it factors in the initial burn of the fixture as opposed to it burning after about six months. Scott's office (Scott Blakely, Insite Engineering) has been out there and we've exchanged the balance among the fixtures. Again, they are the interpretation of the guidelines and that is what the difficult thing has been.

Anthony Oliveri: We've done a walkthrough of the site, also. There are no major issues.

Whitney Singleton: Does the building height change by virtue of the excavation of light?

Austin Cassidy: It has been represented tonight that there is no height change.

Whitney Singleton: Height change is a legal definition.

David Vander Wal: The elevation to the top of the parapet has not changed.

Whitney Singleton: And the parking spaces, whether compliant or not, remains the same size as they were in the original approval?

David Vander Wal: Yes.

Chairman Cosentino: Who is going to be in charge of the lighting?  
Please contact Nanette and Vice Chairman Sturniolo.

David Vander Wal: One of the side issues that we need to clarify is in the guidelines? Are we talking average maintain or initial because there is a tension between what is in the guidelines. The design standards by the IES are average maintained light levels, and the guidelines that have been published by the Board is not clear if that is intended to be initial or average maintained. There is a significant difference in light level for all of these light sources between initial and average maintained. As we work with the committee, we need to know where you're going on that. Because there is a tension between if it's an initial light level, we have a real challenge with meeting the IES minimum average maintained light levels. We need to talk through some of these details.

Chairman Cosentino: Vice Chairman Sturniolo will contact me and Mr. Hertz will sit on them as well as Nanette.

As there was no further business to be discussed by the Planning Board, on a motion by Mr. Bernstein, seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley Bernstein,  
Recording Secretary

dm