

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW PLAN
COMMISSION OF THE VILLAGE OF MONTEBELLO HELD ON TUESDAY,
JANUARY 27, 2009 AT VILLAGE HALL.**

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:40 PM.

Members Present: Thomas Campbell-Chairman
Lance Millman
Jane Burke
Anthony Piazza

Members Absent: Sandra Ward
Melanie Golden

- 1) Opening of Meeting: 7:40 PM
- 2) Roll Call:
- 3) Minutes from December 16, 2008 meeting approved
- 4) Discussion – Village Center II (Hemion and Rt 59):
 - a) Primary concerns with this property
 - a. Traffic
 - b. Appearance
 - c. Monastery’s Privacy
 - b) General agreement regarding appearances:
 - a. Require stone walls along Rt 59 border
 - b. Conservation easement along border with monastery
 - c. No “Sea of Asphalt” visible from 59 or Hemion
 - d. Architectural theming – congruent with Montebello’s “Tree” reputation?
 - i. Adirondack Lodge Style similar to hotel at Bear Mountain?
 - ii. Half-timbered high-gabled (Tudor)?
 - iii. Use of stone on facades?
 - c) Should not be used for a high-traffic purpose
 - a. No large-scale grocery store (e.g. A&P, ShopRight, etc)
 - d) Potential Uses (focused only on the currently undeveloped parcel):
 - a. General agreement that “Village Center” type concept requires a larger parcel that can be developed as a whole. Alternate uses should be considered.
 - b. Upscale Independent Living Facility
 - i. Possibly invoke as a zoning overlay
 - ii. 3 or 4 large buildings, with little/no parking visible from streets.

- iii. Architectural style would be very important
- c. Mixed Retail / Office / Residential
 - i. Some commission members pointed out that nearly 50% (or more) of undeveloped property would have to be commercial / retail to be viable
 - ii. Further discussion required to determine if specific % Residential to Commercial is suggested.
 - iii. Any plan from a developer would require Planning Board approval
 - iv. May also require Special use Permit to require Village Board approval of any project
- d. All residential
 - i. Density would have to be much less than what currently proposed in the 2003 VC II definitions
 - ii. Could allow for differing density on different parts of property (mixed town home, condo, etc.)
 - iii. Generally agreed that single family housing inappropriate / impractical in this location
 - iv. May be some Bronxville / Scarsdale type community models to follow
- e. Further discussion required to reach a recommendation

5) No comments from the public

6) Meeting adjourned at 9:58 PM