

**NORTH CASTLE PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
15 BEDFORD ROAD – COURT ROOM  
7:00 P.M.  
March 10, 2014**

\*\*\*\*\*

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Art Adelman, Chairman  
John Delano,  
Steve Sauro  
Guy Mezzancello  
Christopher Carthy

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Adam R. Kaufman, AICP  
Director of Planning

Joseph Cermele, PE  
Consulting Town Engineer  
Kellard Sessions PC

Roland Baroni, Esq. Town Counsel  
Stephens, Baroni, Reilly & Lewis, LLP

Valerie B. Desimone  
Planning Board Secretary  
Recording Secretary

Conservation Board Representative:  
Larry Nokes

\*\*\*\*\*

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**ZERO OTTO NOVE  
55 Old Route 22  
Section 107.04 Block 2, Lots 10  
Amended site plan application  
Joseph Crocco, Joseph Crocco Architects  
Discussion**

Mr. Adelman read the affidavit of publication for the record. Mrs. Desimone noted that all paperwork was in order for this application, 4 out of 5 green cards were returned. Mr. Howard Arden, abutting property owner was the only noticed neighbor present for this application.

Present for this application were the applicants professionals, Joseph Crocco, and Chris Crocco, architects.

The Applicant is seeking amended approval to construct a 411 square foot addition to the existing 3,710 square foot restaurant. A new outdoor dining trellis is proposed as well as the relocated garbage enclosure area. The Applicant has offered to construct streetscape improvements within the Old Route 22 right-of-way consistent with the Old Route 22 streetscape improvement plan. The proposed amount of off-street parking with the proposed addition does not meet the minimum requirements and the applicant has to appear before the ZBA. The applicant received a variance for the parking spaces on March 6, 2014 from the ZBA. The applicant received ARB conditional approval on March 5, 2014 and has to return to finalize some color choices.

Mr. Crocco presented the application to the board. He noted the two handicapped spaces previously in the front of the building had been moved to the rear of the site and outdoor seating has now been proposed in front of the building and he reviewed the Old Route 22 streetscape improvements proposed. Mr. Arden requested the garbage location be moved from the Southside to the Northside of the lot as he was concerned with the smell and noise associated with the garbage location as it relates to the front of his building. His building is set back from Old Route 22. The applicant was agreeable to move the garbage location. The garbage enclosure will match the rear addition.

Mr. Arden also noted that the wall built between the two lots was supposed to be a solid wall and the wall that was built was a gabion wall and this wall was starting to come apart on this side of the wall. He asked that the repair of this wall be a condition in the resolution of approval. Mr. Delano stated that was an enforcement issue that would be addressed by the Building Inspector. Mr. Kaufman sent a letter to this effect the following day to the Building Inspector.

Mr. Adelman reviewed what the Route 22 street scape plan was for the residents at home who were not familiar with it.

Mr. Delano made a motion to close the public hearing. It was second by Mr. Sauro and approved with five Ayes.

Mr. Adelman asked for a motion to approve the resolution as amended. Mr. Sauro made a motion to approve, it was second by Mr. Delano and approved with five Ayes.

**PUBLIC HEARING con't:**

**96 – 98 COX AVENUE SUBDIVISION**

**96 - 98 Cox Avenue**

**Section 108.01, Block 2, Lots 55 & 54**

**3 Lot Residential Subdivision**

**Frank Madonna**

**Discussion**

The public hearing was continued at this time. The following noticed neighbors were present, Mr. & Mrs. Hendricks, 3 Rose Hill Drive and Jose Berra, 6 Rose Hill Drive.

Mrs. Desimone noted at the last meeting 9 out of 59 green cards were returned regarding this application. Tonight another 25 green cards were returned for a total of 34 out of 59 green cards have been returned since the original mailing on Feb 12, 2014. Also present was Frank Madonna, applicant and his professionals Anthony Veneziano, Esq. Veneziano & Associates. Ralph Alfonzetti, Engineer for the project. Anthony Zaino, Landscape Architect.

The applicant is proposing preliminary subdivision to create three residential lots located in the R-10 Zoning District and the lots total 1.33 acres. Presently the site is broken down into two lots and one of the lots contains an existing residence.

Mr. Veneziano reviewed the different subdivision options presented at the last meeting. He noted that Stormwater and Landscaping were the topics which had the most interest.

Mr. Alfonzetti stated that he submitted a sizing analysis which had calculations for the 100 year storm where only a 25 year storm was required. Mr. Cermele stated that once all of the information is submitted he did not feel there should be any problems addressing the stormwater. It was noted that due to the snow some of the calculations and tests could not be done at this time.

Mr. Zaino reviewed the Landscape plan and noted the variety of the size and material proposed.

In response to Mrs. Hendrik's comment, Mr. Kaufman stated that if any of the plantings die they have to be replaced the next spring. This runs with the land forever. This only applies to the new landscaping on the plan, not the landscaping that presently exists.

Mr. Kaufman noted that he had a meeting with representatives from the fire department, police department and fire marshal. He informed the board that these professionals would prefer one curb cut for emergency access vs. three curb cuts as proposed. Mr.

Veneziano stated that his client would prefer three curb cuts. The board discussed this amongst themselves and concluded that common driveways are a deterrent to people when purchasing a home and concluded they were fine with the three curb cuts.

Mr. Delano recalled at the last meeting that Mrs. Hendricks provided some comments on behalf of her elderly neighbor. He would like to ensure that none of the storm water backs up onto this elderly neighbor's property.

Mr. Kaufman noted that one of the plans presented at the last meeting was not submitted or reviewed before the board. He asked the board if they wanted that plan submitted to the file and review done. The board stated that they were fine with the plan currently before the board and did not feel it was necessary for the professionals to review the plans at this time.

In response to Mr. Hendricks comment regarding closing the public hearing without having all the stormwater details for the neighbors review and comment. Mr. Delano explained that it will be a condition in the resolution that all of the stormwater calculations have to work and the Town Engineer will review that information and if it does not prove out, the project will not go forward and the board will not sign off on the plans. Mr. Hendricks opined that he felt like the applicant was jumping ahead without the professionals knowing if they could do three lots. Mr. Cermele stated that he witnessed the deep hole test and those tests showed to be favorable. The perk tests will determine how big the expansion area will be.

Mr. Hendricks stated that we are moving ahead without proper information. Mr. Adelman stated that he understands but the board is doing their best to balance all concerns from the applicant and the neighbor. He is doing his best to be fair to both sides, the applicant has hired many competent lawyers to do this project and time is money and noted this is a conditional approval and if the stormwater does not work out to the Town's satisfaction then the applicant cannot move forward.

Mr. Jose Berra stated that he has not received notice regarding this public hearing.

Mr. Adelman noted that there were some problems with the deliveries from the Post Office regarding this notification. He asked Mrs. Desimone to comment on that matter.

Mrs. Desimone stated as you may recall at the last meeting on February 24, 2014 only 9 out of 59 of the green cards were returned to the Planning Office the day of the public hearing. That number was unusually low and she went on the USPS web site that afternoon to track the letters and see what was going on with letters. The web site showed that approximately 60 letters were mailed on February 12, 2014 from the Armonk Post Office and were then processed through the USPS sort facility in White Plains the same evening and the letters were returned for delivery to the Armonk Post office on February 13, 2014. Approximately 40 certified letters were delivered back to

the Armonk Post office. As of February 24, 2014, the date of the last board meeting, 30 of those letters sat for 11 days with no attempt of delivery to the residents according to the USPS web site. Another 10 letters had an attempted delivery all at the exact same time of 5:24 p.m. on February 21 which was 8 days after the post office received the letters with no earlier attempts of delivery. The board will be discussing this matter at the end of the meeting this evening.

Mr. Berra suggested the board hold this hearing open one more meet to allow for more residents to have time to get these notices. The board agreed and suggested that the residents present reach out to the neighbors to let them know what was going on.

Mr. Adelman asked for a motion to adjourn the public hearing to the April 7, 2014 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Delano made a motion to adjourn the public hearing, it was second by Mr. Sauro and approved with five Ayes.

#### **CONTINUING BUSINESS:**

***DeCICCO'S SUPERMARKET  
402 Main Street  
Sec 108.01, Block 6, Lot 41  
Mark Miller, Esq. Veneziano & Associates  
Amended site plan re: Mezzanine  
Discussion***

Mark Miller was present for this application.

This is for an Amended Site Plan application for the proposed reconfiguration of the mezzanine level of the DeCeccio's Supermarket located in Armonk Square. The amendment involves changing the use of the mezzanine level from an open mezzanine and office space to supermarket amenity space, including recreation, cooking demonstration area and wine bar. In addition, the size and configuration of the mezzanine is proposed to be modified in size from 3,000 square feet to 4,413 square feet and the supermarket selling floor was reduced in size approximately 1500 square feet. The project is located within the CB-A Zoning District on a 3.43 acre parcel.

Mr. Miller requested a public hearing be set for the March 24, 2014. Mr. Adelman asked for a motion to schedule the public hearing for March 24, 2014, Mr. Carthy made a motion to approve, it was second by Mr. Sauro and approved with five ayes.

**MBIA**

**King Street, Cooney Hill, Weber Place**

**Sec 113.04, Blk 1, Lots 13 & 14, Section 118.02, Block 1, Lot 1**

**Mark Miller, Esq. Veneziano & Associates**

**Discussion**

**Consideration of extension of time site plan amendment resolution**

On January 11, 2006, the North Castle Town Board adopted Local Law No. 2 – 2006, which Local Law amended Section 213-33(Q) of the Town Code and authorized the Planning Board to grant extended site plan approval in circumstances where the Town Board had granted a special permit pursuant to Section 213-33(Q). On March 24, 2004, the Town Board had granted to MBIA a special permit pursuant to Section 213-33(Q), which special permit expires on March 24, 2014. On February 26, 2014, the Town Board granted to MBIA an extension of the special permit to March 24, 2019. The Planning Board believes and finds that it is in the mutual best interest of both the Town and MBIA to grant an extension of the site plan approval expiration to March 24, 2019.

Mr. Adelman asked for a motion to approve the extension of time to March 24, 2019. Mr. Delano made a motion to approve. It was second by Mr. Sauro and approved with five Ayes.

**170 BEDFORD ROAD**

**162 Bedford Road**

**Sec 108.03, Block 1, Lot 42**

**Chris Crocco, Joseph R. Crocco Architects PC**

**Site plan development of 20, 2 bedroom units on the former .80 acre lumber yard site**

**Discussion**

Present for this application was the property owner, Michael Fareri and his professionals Joseph Crocco and Dan Holt.

The site plan application is for the redevelopment of the former Bedford Road lumber yard site. The proposed redevelopment proposes demolition of the existing structures and the construction of an approximately 29,766 square foot 25 unit residential apartment building. The applicant's last proposal before the board was for an 18 unit 25,257 square foot proposal associated with the previously approved zoning amendments to permit residential uses on the site.

Mr. Fareri reviewed the history of the lot from when it was the lumber yard to his application today. He also noted that the former lumberyard was 100% impervious.

Mr. Holt stated that the drainage will go front to back on site and will be broken down into quadrants, the soils are good. He will be able to address Mr. Cermele's comments in his memos. He asked the board for their comments regarding the proposed garages at the rear of the site. If the board likes the garages vs. the parking spaces they will lose two parking spaces. He also noted there were no three bedroom units proposed in response to a comment made in Mr. Kaufman's memo. Four of the garages may be lost due to the side yard setback. The applicant felt it was better delineation to the school property with garages vs. a fence. The board did not see any down side to the garages.

Discussions were had regarding the size of the garage, the code states the size of the garage is 10 x 20 and the applicant is proposing 10 x 18 and is not sure if he can get from 18 feet to the full 20 feet. Mr. Fareri stated that if they can't get 20 feet they will eliminate the garages all together as he would prefer not to go the ZBA at this time. Mr. Cermele stated he will look into how this matter was addressed in the past. Mr. Adelman noted that Mr. Holt was the former consulting town engineer.

Mr. Holt noted that if a side walk has to be installed at the rear of the site, there would not be enough back up room from the garage at the rear of the site.

Mr. Crocco handed out some plans at this time showing the differences between the last submission and this submission. He noted the floor area was smaller with this new plan. There will be 9 MIU's on the first floor, 8 units on the second floor and 8 units on the third floor. The application conforms to the zoning and is 1,500 square feet smaller than the last submission.

Mr. Fareri presented the differences from the original plan to the new plan before the board this evening. He stated the original plan was 80' x 120', 26,666 sq. ft., 7 MIU's, 11 market rate units, Grand Total of 18 units with brick building. Tonight's proposal is 70' x 123', 25,285 square feet, 9 MIU'S, 16 Market rate units, Grand total of 25 apartments with clapboard siding.

Mr. Fareri stated that there has been some consideration of rezoning this lot to affordable units vs. MIU's. He is meeting with Supervisor Schiliro and Mr. Kaufman tomorrow morning on this subject matter. Mr. Fareri purchased the property ten years ago with the intention of building apartments.

Mr. Fareri requested the board declare lead agency intent and schedule a public hearing regarding this application for April 21, 2014.

Mr. Fareri stated that the stormwater issues will be addressed prior to the public hearing. Mr. Kaufman noted ARB approval is needed prior to that meeting as well. Mr. Fareri

stated that he would like to get conceptual approval regarding the exterior and interior of the building and not submit construction drawings to the ARB as that is needed for a building permit. Mr. Kaufman will follow up with the ARB regarding the submission of the construction drawings. Mr. Fareri stated that he would also like the MIU's to be rentals vs. selling them. There are people who don't have down payments to purchase a unit or don't want to purchase a unit and this would be a good choice.

Mr. Adelman supports the proposal and it does not impact the neighborhood.

In response to a comment made regarding residential homes in the area, Mr. Fareri stated that there is a house next door, Mr. Green lives there. He then reviewed the other uses and business in the neighborhood at the present time.

Discussions were had regarding the height of the building and Mr. Kaufman suggested the applicant schedule an appointment with the Building Inspector to discuss the height of the building and the high point to flat roof.

The board likes the dormers and garages proposed for this application and would like the applicant to address the comments in the professional's memos.

Mr. Carthy stated that he did not like that all nine MIU's were on the first floor. He thinks they should be spread throughout the building. Mr. Fareri stated that this is the way we designed the building and everything fits, he noted in Whippoorwill Hills there were separate buildings for all of the MIU's.

Mr. Adelman asked for a motion to declare lead agency intent. Mr. Delano made a motion, it was second by Mr. Sauro and approved with five Ayes.

The public hearing was scheduled for April 21, 2014.

## **MONTEFORTE**

**35 Orchard Drive**

**Section 107.02, Block 4, Lot 11**

**Subdivision, lot line, wetland permit and site plan approval for building expansion and renovations of existing structures**

**Rob Aiello, PE John Meyer Consulting**

**Discussion**

Rob Aiello, PE John Meyer Consulting was present as well as Fred Cheffron, project manager for the applicant.



Mr. Aiello stated that his client has decided not to proceed with the subdivision at this time and will proceed with the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor addition to the main residence with dormers along with other site improvements. The cottage residence will remain the same. During 1980, the garage was converted into a legal non-conforming accessory apartment and received a variance from the ZBA at the time. He is scheduled to appear before the Conservation Board on March 18, 2014 and will discuss at the time the mitigation proposed on site. He still needs to submit to the ARB. A public hearing was set for April 7, 2014. This will give the applicant time to appear before the CB and ARB.

In response to Mr. Cheffron's comment, Mr. Kaufman stated that if the applicant gets both referrals in time for the public hearing, the board can consider a resolution of approval the same evening.

**SILVERSTEIN**  
**33 Wampus Lake Drive**  
**Section 107.02, Block 2, Lot 11**  
**Referral from RPRC - Pool**  
**Neave Group, Lee Kind**  
**Discussion**

This application is for the construction of a 720 square foot in-ground pool, patio, screened porch and walkway. This project was referred to the Planning Board by the Residential Project Review Committee.

Present for the applicant was Lee Kind, Neave Group.

The Planning Board and Conservation Board conducted a site walk on March 7, 2014.

Mr. Kind noted he will need a referral to the ZBA regarding the setbacks and a wetland permit from the Conservation Board regarding the stream.

Mr. Delano suggested a plan with less of a variance needed or to reduce the size of the pool, reduce the size of the porch or eliminate the pool or porch.

Mr. Kind noted the septic was located in the front of the house and his proposal tried to incorporate access from the front of the lot to the rear of the lot.

Mr. Carthy stated that he wanted to be careful about eliciting false hope. He is concerned that the setback is 50' and the applicant is proposing this pool within 15' of the property line, he was also concerned with noise associated with this use and the close proximity of the property line. He was not convinced that there is enough room for everything the applicant is proposing.

Mr. Kind stated that he could put the pool on the side of the house which would have a pool wall facing the neighbor and felt the abutting neighbor to the side would not want to look at the wall. The abutting neighbor to the rear has his house set up higher than this site. The hill will take in some of the noise. The house to the rear will overlook this house. If the pool is located on the side of the house, he is concerned with the proximity of the applicants well to the proposed pool site.

Mr. Adelman stated that this pool is really shoe horned into the site vs. nestled into the site. He did not feel he could make a positive recommendation to the ZBA regarding this application. He is very concerned about the adjacent property hearing noise.

Mr. Kind will try and move the pool closer to the residence but needs to follow up with the building inspector regarding the proximity of the roof line and the pool location. Mr. Adelman noted he was still concerned with having a pool in the back yard and the impacts on the neighbors. Mr. Sauro noted that he was very cautious about setting a bad precedent with the application as proposed. He stated that if Mr. Kind would massage the plan, he would be happy to listen again.

Discussions continued regarding a pool location on the north side of the house and if built in that location, there would not be any sunlight and would be located in the wetlands.

The applicant will go back to the client with the suggestions made this evening about reducing the size of the pool, moving the pool location closer to the house, eliminating the pool or eliminating the screened porch or researching locating the pool closer to the residence or located partially in the rock outcropping.

**MANN**  
**3 Gifford Lake Drive**  
**Section 102.03, Block 1, Lot 50**  
**Referral from RPRC – New Construction**  
**Catazone Engineering, Richard Kotz Architect**  
**Discussion**

Present for this application was Peter Catazone and Richard Kotz.

This application is for the construction of a 10,700 square foot home on an existing vacant building lot within the Round Hill at Gifford Lake (Schulman) subdivision which was approved in the late 1980s. This project was referred to the Planning Board from the Residential Project Review Committee. The Gifford Lake Subdivision includes a construction zone and preservation zone. The plat map notes that “within the

designated "preservation zone" on each lot, the removal of trees of six inches (6") or more in diameter at breast height shall be prohibited except for dead or diseased trees. Stone walls shall not be damaged, destroyed or removed.

Mr. Catazone stated that this was the last lot to be developed from this subdivision. The applicant is complying with the layout shown on the original subdivision as much as possible. The four bedroom house will have 7,400 square feet of living space, patio and pool. The well and septic will serve the lot.

Discussions were had regarding the construction zone and preservation zone on this lot and for the entire subdivision. It was noted that Mr. Catazone must submit an updated tree survey showing trees that are 6 inch in diameter (per preservation zone) and 8 inch in diameter which is considered a significant tree according to the town code. Mr. Catazone stated that he should be able to build the house and not remove any trees within the preservation zone. He noted that there was no expansion area designated at the time of the subdivision. The board asked that the IPP be presented at the next meeting as Mr. Delano found it hard to believe that the Board of Health signed off on a Subdivision without an expansion area.

Mr. Kaufman noted that the Construction & Preservation zones were similar in nature to the Clearing and Grading Limit Line (CGLM) but with the Clearing and Grading Limit Line, the Planning Board had the flexibility to change the line if they deemed it appropriate. The Construction and Preservation lines had no flexibility to be changed by anyone.

Mr. Mann inquired why do you need an expansion area, with the new technology which lets you revive and remediate the failed system an expansion area is not necessary. Mr. Baroni stated that you cannot play that fast and loose with Westchester County.

Mr. Mann stated that 26 year ago; these trees were so small it would not be a problem vs. developing today the trees are significantly larger. He inquired what if one of his neighbors today needed an expansion area or septic area today, what was approved 30 years ago had no trees and was not a problem but 30 years later, the trees that were looked at then are much larger now.

Mr. Carthy suggested the applicant reduce the house size and reduce the pool size and see if that would help the situation. Mr. Mann stated that it would not work, all of the other houses in the neighborhood have four bedrooms, what he is proposing is not unreasonable for the neighborhood.

Mr. Baroni inquired if any of the trees in the preservation zone were dead or sick. The applicant's professional did not know the answer. Mr. Baroni stated that if a new plat were filed with the signatures of all the property owners within the subdivision removing the notes or updating the language with some flexibility given to the Planning Board.

That would be a way to resolve this issue as well.

Mr. Cermele told the applicant that the expansion area did not need to be uniform as presented.

Mr. Delano asked for a slope analysis and percolation rates for the lot.

Mr. Mezzancello suggested the applicant abandon the pool at this time to get his house done and look into another pool space at a later date.

Mr. Cermele noted that the applicant needed to make sure they stayed out of the 100' state wetland boundary.

## **WHIPPOORWILL CLUB TURF MANAGEMENT MAINTENANCE FACILITY**

**Whippoorwill Road**

**Section 100.04, Block 1, Lot 41**

**Karl Ackerman, Sullivan Architecture, PC.**

**14,400 sq. ft. two story Turf Management & Maintenance Facility**

### **Discussion**

Present for this application was Karl Ackerman, Sullivan Architecture and Mike Kolba, John Meyer Consulting.

This is an amended site plan application to construct a 14,400 square foot two story Turf Management & Maintenance Facility that replaces the existing outdated facility. In addition, the proposed plan includes the establishment of a standalone chemical storage building, a vehicle and equipment wash area and the construction of a sand silo.

As noted previously, Mr. Baroni is a member of the Whippoorwill club.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the rendering submitted was very helpful and gave a good impact that the visual impacts can be mitigated. Mr. Ackerman presented the rendering at this time. Mr. Carthy stated that the applicant has done a great job with these plans and the application altogether.

Mr. Kaufman asked Mr. Ackerman if he saw the comments in his memo regarding comments made by the emergency service providers regarding the type of monitoring and alarms for the storage building. They also requested some additional information on the MSDS sheets. Mr. Ackerman stated he will address those comments from the emergency providers. Mr. Ackerman responded to the comments in Mr. Kaufman's memo regarding lighting on site, the canopy lights are turned on and off with a switch and will be used when filling a maintenance truck with gasoline and then turned off.

The building mounting lights will be on photo cells and will be off during the winter months. We don't want the lights turning on and off when deer run by. There will be a few lights on for security but will be very sensitive to the neighbors.

Mr. Baroni inquired about the removal of the old water tank on site. Mr. Kolba stated that they are working on getting that removed. They did get estimates a while back and are working on getting current estimates. When they hire a company to remove the tank they will incorporate that into this portion of the project. Mr. Baroni stated that the Water Superintendent had no use for this water tank located in water district #5 and suggested the applicant get that in writing from Mr. Misiti.

Mr. Ackerman presented the site section to the board. He stated that the Sand Silo was added to the plan but it is no higher than the existing building. The Sand silo was presented in the rendering but it was not visible.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the applicant is making good progress with this application. He inquired about the status of the septic portion in New Castle. Mr. Kolba stated that he has to reach out to the engineer in New Castle. No sampling of the soil has been done yet due to the weather. He will submit a plan design to New Castle once it is completed. Mr. Kaufman stated that he felt at this time the applicant has enough information to finalize their special use permit with the Town Board and suggested the applicant submit their application to the Town Board but noted the Town Board could not render a decision until the Planning Board completed SEQR. Mr. Ackerman stated that he will make a submission to the Town Board. Mr. Kaufman stated that the applicant needed to go to the ARB as well. Mr. Ackerman inquired if the construction drawings had to be submitted to the ARB. Mr. Kaufman noted another applicant inquired about that same thing earlier in the meeting and he will follow up with the ARB.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the applicant needs to address the comments in both memos and return to the Planning Board make a SEQR determination. Once SEQR is determined the applicant can go to the Town Board for the Special Use Permit. Mr. Cermele requested that the information that will impact the stormwater be submitted prior to a Planning Board Public Hearing. He would also like the applicant to submit the location of the septic tanks and pipe crossings and infiltration systems all work together. He wants to review all of this information to make sure it works.

Mr. Ackerman stated that he will submit the tree removal information as requested. There are five trees to be removed.

**MAOUNIS**

**5 Ashfields Lane**

**Section 102.03, Block 2, Lot 34**

**Amended Site Plan**

**Geraldine Tortorella, Esq. Hocherman Tortorella & Wekstein, LLP**

**Consideration of amended site plan resolution**

The Applicant is seeking amended approval to reduce the size of the proposed home, change some exterior materials and relocate the construction staging area. The proposed site plan is consistent with the previously approved site plan.

Mr. Adelman asked for a motion to approve the amended Maounis resolution. Mr. Delano made a motion to approve, it was second by Mr. Sauro and approved with four ayes.

**ONE LABRIOLA COURT**

**1 Labriola Court**

**Section 2, Block 11, Lot 13.-1**

**Robert Peake, AICP John Meyer Consulting**

**Consideration of site plan waiver**

The Applicant is proposing a reallocation of various uses within the existing building. The proposed new mix of uses includes office, warehouse and dramatic arts school uses, all of which are permitted within the RELIP Zoning District. One hundred eight off-street parking spaces are required for the proposed mix of uses, while 116 off-street parking spaces are provided on the site. No site changes are proposed and all work to accommodate the new tenant will occur within the building. The board has received a site plan waiver from the Building Inspector.

Mr. Adelman asked for a motion to approve the one Labriola Court site plan waiver. Mr. Delano made a motion to approve, it was second by Mr. Sauro and approved with five Ayes.

Meeting adjourned at 10:18 p.m.