

**NORTH CASTLE PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
15 BEDFORD ROAD – COURT ROOM  
7:00 P.M.  
September 12, 2016**

\*\*\*\*\*

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Steve Sauro, Acting Chairman  
Christopher Carthy  
Michael Pollack  
Jim Jensen

**Planning Board Member Absent:**

John P. Delano, Chairman

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Adam R. Kaufman, AICP  
Director of Planning

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

Joseph Cermele, PE  
Consulting Town Engineer  
Kellard Sessions PC

Valerie B. Desimone  
Planning Board Secretary  
Recording Secretary

Conservation Board Representative:  
Zenaida Bongaarts

:

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**August 1, 2016**

Mr. Sauro asked for a motion to approve the August 1, 2016 Planning Board minutes as amended. Mr. Pollack made a motion to approve, it was second by Mr. Carthy and approved with three Ayes. Mr. Jensen abstained and Mr. Delano was not present.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**GREEN DROP LLC**

**660 North Broadway**

**122.20-1-33**

**Site Plan**

**Michael Piccirillo, Architect, Michael Piccirillo Architecture PLLC**

**Discussion**

**Consideration of resolution of approval**

The Applicant is seeking approval to redevelop the former 1,909 square foot gas station property as a personal service establishment for donating gently used clothing and household goods.

Mr. Sauro read the affidavit of publication for the record. Present for this application was Michelle Fallot – 11 Kensico Knoll; Nancy Battestelli at 15 Intervale avenue; Maureen Keller at 24 Smallwood Place and Edward Loberman at 42 Nethermont Avenue. Tom D'Agostino, 87 Cloverdale Avenue, Mrs. Desimone noted that all paperwork was in order for this application.

Also present for this application was Michael Piccirillo, architect for the applicant and Osmond Mincarelli - Green Drop site acquisitions. Michael Marrino - Getty Realty.

Mr. Piccirillo stated that the garage, shed & enclosure will be removed, the site will be cleaned up and landscaping will be added to the site; the proposed landscaping will be increased 25% and the siding color will be changed per comments at the ARB. The canopy will remain.

Mr. Loberman noted he was speaking on behalf of his wife. They have been residents for over 50 years and are members of the beautification committee, his wife objects to the canopy and would like it removed which would be an improvement to the area and does not feel the canopy beautifies the town in any capacity. He noted that Mr. Jensen had objected to the canopy the first time this application was before the board. His wife would like the canopy removed. Mr. Loberman stated that he does not want a temporary CO issued on this lot either.

Mrs. Keller stated that she was also on the Beautification Committee and agreed that the canopy should come down, the canopy is reminiscent of a gas station, and the plans do not show that area under the canopy as a drop-off area. She expressed concerns about items being dropped off at the site that Green Drop would not accept, where would those items go.

Mrs. Fallott stated that she had no issues with the application but wanted the eyesore of the canopy removed.

Mr. D'Agostino stated that he was happy this use was going on site. He expressed his concerns about the traffic and noted this was a very busy intersection and was concerned about safety issues for emergency personnel. He would like some markings in the road for pedestrians to cross the road. A DOT permit is needed for the right of way; he would like a cross walk across Route 22 to the site.

Mr. D'Agostino would like a buffer of arborvitae along the property line where the garage will be removed to provide separation between the commercial property and residential property behind it. He noted the canopy was an eyesore and it is really huge. When it was originally proposed he was against it and this originally had a lot of glare when used. He inquired what the hours of operation were and the size of the trucks and how many trucks a week will be on site and parked on site, how many cars a day will be in the staging area. How do we prevent stuff being left there after hours when no one is on site to receive it? He inquired if Green Drop was registered in New York as he did not see Green Drop as a corporation to do business in New York State on the web site.

Mr. Sauro inquired about the landscaping at the rear of the site. Mr. Piccirillo agreed to the landscaping at the rear of the site and also agreed that the driveway at the rear towards the garage was no longer necessary since the garage was going to be removed and could be returned to grass.

Mr. Mincarelli addressed some of the comments recently raised by the neighbors. He stated that Business hours are M-F from 8:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m.; Saturdays 8:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. and Sunday's 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. No trucks will be stored on site. A single axel box truck will come on site to pick up the donated items two or three times a week. One vehicle for the employee will be parked on site. The trash from the attendant will be taken away by the attendant, a dumpster will not be necessary. Items not sellable will be removed by truck. Donations are brought into the building and out to the truck. Vehicles will stop and donate near the garage door, nothing is stored outside. There will be an average of 40 donors a day and their busiest time is between 10:00 – 2:00 p.m. and Saturday mornings. No large items will be accepted like couches, TV's or washer dryers. The canopy provides coverage during inclement weather. Things left after hours are Green Drops responsibility and if it is something they don't accept a truck will be called the same day for removal of that item. There will be security cameras on site and if drop offs are regularly done at night that are not acceptable they will prosecute. You can choose which organization you want to donate to, American Red Cross, Purple Heart, and American Federation for the Blind, a tax deductible receipt is issued with each drop off; the donor has to put a value on the items donated.

Mr. Carthy noted if the bay doors are operable that can provide shelter when the Green Drop employee unloads the car. Mr. Piccirillo stated that the canopy makes it convenient to donate. In response to Mr. Carthy's comment, Mr. Mincarelli stated that the attendants do offer to remove the items from the car, sometimes the donors prefer to do it themselves.

Mr. Carthy asked Mr. Mincarelli if they had gotten an estimate for the removal of the canopy. Mr. Mincarelli did not get an estimate and stated that a light study was done

and light will not go out that far and will not create a blur. He noted that in regards to upkeep of the awning and the canopy, Green Drop wants to be part of the community, not a nuisance; they look for middle to upper-class communities to have our donation centers. These are the areas that have donations that can be resold. Their intention is to keep the area looking really good.

Mr. Sauro confirmed with Mr. Mincarelli that an estimate for removal of the canopy was not done, Mr. Mincarelli stated they did not have an estimate. Mr. Sauro stated that he does not want to incur additional costs at the beginning of the applicant's project but the canopy is an unnecessary eyesore and this is a great opportunity to get it removed.

Mr. Mincarelli stated that the building is in poor shape and they will have to put a lot of money into the building to bring it up to code, the electric, plumbing, landscaping, plantings all have to be done on site. The site has to be brought up to ADA compliance as well. The canopy provides coverage during inclement weather, provides additional lighting on sight for safety reasons at night time and the awning is good advertising,

In response to Mr. Sauro's comment, Mr. Piccirillo stated that the ARB has reviewed this application and asked for 25% more landscaping and changed the color of the green in the awning, there were no issues with the canopy itself.

Mr. Sauro stated that he wants the site to blend more and not be so striking.

Mr. Loberman stated that he was speaking on his own behalf and is somewhat dismayed, the applicant is contradicting themselves regarding the canopy, they say it is to keep the clients dry and then say the clients don't have to get out of the car, staff will bring the donations into the building. The applicant is worried about the cost not the client. Mr. Loberman is worried about the long term future of the community and this is an eyesore. You can get enough lighting for the sight without a canopy.

Mr. Carthy noted the ARB has to work with what they have, they can not advise an applicant to remove anything.

Mr. Jensen stated that the design intent originally when built was to protect the person who was pumping the gas from inclement weather. He struggles with the benefit of the canopy with this application. This is a non-conforming use and canopy hangs five feet over the front yard setback. This will not satisfy the need that the applicant described. He did not think this would be a substantial differentiator for the applicant to have the canopy.

Mr. Piccirillo stated that in regards to the monetary value of removing the awning. It was hard for the landlord to find a tenant to occupy the former gas station. The additional cost of removing the canopy may send this project over budget. If this were to return to a gas station, they may not fix up the site. Mr. Baroni stated that this is a nonconforming use and has been closed for so long that it can't return to the old use. Mr. Baroni asked if the occupant has the right to remove the canopy. Mr. Piccirillo stated that he did not know. Mr. Piccirillo stated that we discussed the canopy once

before with the board and his client said that he wanted to keep the canopy and we proceeded to move forward and now at the public hearing finding out this is an issue. Mr. Jensen noted he brought this issue up at the first meeting. Mr. Kaufman noted that noticed neighbors are bringing this matter up at the public hearing tonight

Mr. Pollack confirmed that the fire suppression system was also stored in the canopy.

Mr. Loberman stated that this is our opportunity as residents to speak tonight and four members of the community and four members of the beautification committee are asking to have the canopy removed.

Mr. D'Agostino inquired if the paved part where the garage is located will become grass along with the driveway accessing the garage be returned to grass, Mr. Piccirillo agreed. He noted that Green Drop will be open on Saturdays and Sundays and the patrons who attend church on Sunday's park at the site right now and park there on Saturday evenings during family events. The parking is very congested on Cloverdale during these times. He was concerned with access for the church patrons from this site to Cloverdale Avenue.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the town was aware of this and the Police Department wants to reach out to the neighboring commercial properties to see if there are any opportunities to provide some shared parking. Mr. Sauro inquired if Green Drop would permit some parking on their site. Discussions were had at this time where cars could park on site. It was agreed that this would not happen during business hours.

Mr. Marrino (Getty Realty) stated that Getty is subleasing to Green Drop and will discuss parking on site with the Town and church.

Discussions of the canopy lighting were had at this time. The canopy lighting would be restored, the focus of the lighting will go straight down, and there will be no glare past the site. The Pole sign will remain.

Mr. Sauro asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Carthy made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Pollack second the motion and it was approved with four ayes. Mr. Delano was not present for the vote.

The board started summarizing their thoughts at this time. Mr. Carthy stated that the tenant is improving the space, the applicant wants to rent a gas station, the beautification committee wants the canopy removed and the board over the years has been aggressive in getting work done to the site while an applicant was before the board, he is seeing the side of the beautification committee, if we don't fix it now, we may never get another opportunity to do it. Mr. Jensen agreed with Mr. Carthy's comments. Mr. Pollack noted the fire suppression would have to be removed and there is a cost incurred with that. He then spoke about the cost of removing the canopy vs. the cost to repair the canopy. He appreciates good signage and advertisement along with the canopy protection with inclement weather. He concluded - can the canopy be

removed and still provide good signage for the site. He also recalled that this gas station was a non-conforming use.

Mr. Baroni noted all gas stations in North Castle are a non-conforming use.

It was noted that the non-conforming use vs. encroachment of the canopy and there was nothing to suggest the canopy was not legal. It was presumed it got the proper channels at the time it was built.

Mr. Mincarelli stated that they never contemplated the removal of the canopy; his tenant's use is outside for their use and operations. The business is outside and the loss of the canopy would cause significant loss of sales.

Mr. Baroni inquired if the owner would permit the removal of the canopy. Mr. Marrino stated that Getty has had a lease with the site since the 1960's and does not know if the landlord would permit removal of the awning or not. We could also leave it vacant for the last five years of the lease.

Mrs. Keller noted that the staging area on the plans is by the bay doors, not under the canopy. Mr. Plccirillo explained this was a loading area, according to the code.

Mr. Baroni inquired that once the lease expires would the awning have to be removed. Mr. Marrino stated no, the canopy would not have to be removed as part of the lease.

Mr. Sauro asked Mr. Marrino to reach out to the property owner regarding the canopy. Mr. Marrino stated that he does not have a good relationship with the landlord to discuss that at this time.

Mr. Pollack inquired what the deadline was for applicant to get this done. Mr. Mincarelli stated that the deadline has already passed. Mr. Pollack also questioned would another sign be any less of an eyesore on site.

Mr. Baroni suggested the church should reach out to the neighbors and made their own arrangements.

Mr. Pollack inquired if Getty was paying for the improvement or Green Drop. It was noted that the majority of the improvements were going to be paid by Getty Realty who has another five years left on the lease.

Mr. D'Agostino stated that Getty Realty let the site get into the condition that it is today.

Mr. Pollack noted that do you want a better site or nothing at all, if we decide to require the awning to be removed, the town runs the risk of nothing happening to the site.

Mr. Jensen stated that the cost to fix the leaking roof, remove the fire suppression and all of the costs to fix up the awning vs. removal of the awning is close to the same cost.

Mr. Mincarelli stated that there are three parties involved regarding the cost and maintenance and the improvements total over \$100,000 and the majority will be paid by Getty. He has worked the last 1 ½ years to rent this site out for the last five years of the lease.

Mr. Marrino stated they have already agreed to remove the garage, the shed and the driveway. Sales will drop without the canopy and the value of items collected will be reduced.

Mr. Sauro asked if the applicant wanted to wait for a full board for a vote. Mr. Marrino did not want to wait.

Mr. Sauro asked for a motion to approve the resolution as amended incorporating screening at the rear of the site and provide some plantings which would require some removal of the driveway and keeping the existing canopy in place. No one made a motion to approve as amended.

Mr. Carthy made a motion to approve the resolution as amended with removal of the canopy. Mr. Pollack second the motion and it was approved with four Ayes. Mr. Delano was not present for the vote.

**CRINITI**  
**2 Barnard Road**  
**108.03 - 3 - 60**  
**Special Use Permit - Accessory Apartment**  
**Roy Fredriksen, PE Rayex Design Group**  
**Discussion**  
**Consideration of resolution of approval**

The application for the construction of a new 1,038 square foot accessory apartment adjacent to the existing 3,242 square foot home on a 1.1 acre lot located within the R-1A Zoning District. In addition, the plans depict a new 307 square foot second floor addition.

Mr. Sauro read the affidavit of publication for the record. Mrs. Desimone noted all paperwork was in order for this application. The following noticed neighbors were present: Nick Gagliardi – 6 Barnard Road; David Zeng – 46 North Greenwich road; Mrs. Phyllis Traweek – 5 Barnard Road.

Present on behalf of the applicant was their professionals Bill Besherooff, Rayex Design Group.

Mr. Besherooff stated that he has received ARB approval and Board of Health approval. He presented the application to the board and members of the public.

Mr. Zeng stated that he has no objections to the improvements proposed. He noted the accessory apartment makes this a two family house and this will decrease the value of the neighborhood, this is not Yonkers. Armonk should remain Armonk, a large home is fine, the bigger the better.

Mr. Kaufman noted that from a zoning perspective the Town Board has created this special use permit and approved this type of apartment in single family residential districts throughout the town. If they meet the criteria for a special use permit then the Town Board has deemed this use as something they want to permit.

In response to Mr. Zeng's comment. Mr. Kaufman stated that when the house is sold if the accessory apartment is vacant then the accessory use permit approval disappears. The exception to that is if the house is sold and the apartment is still occupied the use is still valid during the land transfer. Either unit can be occupied by the property owner, but the property owner must live on site, they cannot live off site and rent both spaces out

Mrs. Traweck stated that in 1994 she was granted to do the exact same thing for her parents as the Criniti's are proposing today. After her parents passed she used it as a guest room and now her granddaughter lives there. She was told at the time if she wanted to rent out the space and get paid for that she would have to get all sorts of permits. The Criniti's are doing the same thing she did and if this was granted to one family then it should be granted to everyone, she has known the Criniti's a long time and they are lovely people and would not do anything to hurt anyone or the neighborhood. There are all sorts of things going on her street that no one is bothering to notice and this would be unjust to not permit this approval.

Mr. Kaufman noted for the record that this approval would also permit this applicant to rent the space in the future for money. Mrs. Traweck stated that she did not agree with Mr. Kaufman's statement.

Mr. Gagliardi stated that he would like improvements made to the neighborhood but was concerned with the location of the septic system and where it drains. He did work at Mr. Criniti's home about eight years ago when he put on an addition to his ( Mr. Criniti's house). There is a footing drain that discharges onto Barnard Road from his home which runs into a six inch curtain drain which the Board of Health designed at the time. The new septic system has been designed over the curtain drain which can go into the catch basin and to Mr. Decker's pond and Mr. Zeng's pond and Roth's Nursery. He is a licensed septic system contractor for 32 years. As long as the applicant is going through all of the proper approvals it will be alright. .

Mr. Gagliardi stated that there is a knoll between the lots and if the knoll is removed he was concerned that the water drainage will go onto his lot and flood out his septic system. Where the Criniti's put the infiltrator system, he was not sure if there was enough capacity in what was proposed for this new footing drain to be tied in. Mr. Gagliardi was concerned about the new well the applicant drilled and was not sure if it



would meet the setbacks if more infiltrators need to be installed.

Mr. Sauro was concerned about the curtain drain and the septic going on top of that. Mr. Cermele stated that he has been asking for the existing drainage facilities to be shown on the plan and they have not been shown on the plan. We can make the Board the of Health aware of what may or may not be there, it may result in some exploratory excavation as to what may or may not be there and find that location so that the system can be designed properly. With regard to the knoll on the left side of the house, the plan does not show any regrading in that area. If regrading is done, it would be done in violation to plan as shown today which shows no grading in that area. In regards to the infiltration system, he has requested storm water design of the system and he has not witnessed any soil testing yet and there has been no request to go out to the site and for the test. He has not received the storm water design calculations.

The board was reluctant to move forward with this application based on all of the missing information that has been requested but not received.

Mrs. Criniti stated that the Board of Health did the soil test for the septic system. Mr. Cermeli stated the soil testing that needs to be is regarding the storm water system which his office needs to witness.

Mr. Besheroff stated he was not aware of the points brought up and cannot answer them, the public hearing can continue and he will look into these items and address them.

Mr. Zeng noted that his pond drains into Byram Lake which is a drinking water source for the residents of Mount Kisco.

Mr. Sauro asked for a motion to adjourn the public hearing so the applicant can submit the outstanding information noted earlier this evening by the Town Engineer. Mr. Pollack made a motion to approve. It was second by Mr. Carthy and approved with four Ayes. Mr. Delano was not present.

Mr. Besheroff stated that he will reach out to the Town Engineer regarding the outstanding items, He asked Mr. Gagliardi if there was an as built done at the time of the addition.

**CONTINUING BUSINESS:**

**PINKUS**

**5 COWDRAY PARK DRIVE**

**102.04 - 1 - 28**

**Special Use Permit - Accessory Garage**

**Kory Salomone, Esq. The Law Office of Kory Salomone P.C.**

**Discussion**

Present for this application was Petra Garza, Architect for the applicant; Jorel Vaccaro, PE from Dominick R. Pilla Associates and Kory Salomone, attorney for the applicant.

The application for construction of a 1,600 square foot, two story, and two tandem car garage/barn on a 12.6-acre lot located within the R-2A Zoning District.

Mr. Vaccaro reviewed the items in the Town Engineers memo and noted how he would be able to comply with each item or how he would proceed to comply. He will stake out the wetland and watercourses in the field.

Ms. Garza noted that her client will store cars that are not going to be used on a daily basis in the barn. She was aware that she needed to get ARB approval.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the wetlands need to be confirmed by the Kellard Sessions office, the applicant needs to go to the Conservation Board, a site walk should be scheduled, the applicant needs ARB approval, he noted that based on the size of the lot this structure was small in comparison..

Based on comments from Mr. Pollack, Mr. Vaccaro stated that there will be no bathrooms proposed and the floor drains in the garage were proposed so that the floor could be hosed down.

**CARQUEST**

**215 BUSINESS PARK DRIVE**

**114.01 - 1 - 1**

**Amended Site Plan**

**Michael Finan, EP LEED-AP Langan Engineering**

**Discussion**

The application for a proposed 44,658 square foot warehouse and office expansion and various additional site improvements. The property is 36.76± acres and is located at 215 Business Park Drive within the PLI Zoning District. The site is currently developed with a 112,000± square foot warehouse/office building. The proposed warehouse expansion will be located within the NYSDEC adjacent area for state wetland G-1 and within a Town-regulated wetland and wetland buffer.

Present for this application was Chuck Utschig, PE from Langan Engineering.

Mr. Utschig presented the application to the board. He has spoken to the NYCDEC and Proposed that they reduce their wetland buffer to 50' in exchange for some wetland mitigation. He has met with staff preliminarily. He has reviewed both professionals' memos and is aware of what needs to be done. .

In response to Mr. Sauro's comments. Mr. Utschig stated that his client does not know who will be going into this warehouse space at this time. His client may even take over this space, he is not sure who will go into this space.

Mr. Sauro asked once a client is determined; the town would like to be informed as to what chemicals would be on site. Mr. Utschig stated his client can comply with that request.

Mr. Jensen noted this building was going through the flood plains and would like to discuss that. Mr. Utschig stated that a portion of this is being built within the flood plane and a flood plane calculation has been submitted. A preliminary analysis has also been submitted regarding the downstream drainage area. Conversations were had by Mr. Cermele and Mr. Utschig regarding this matter at this time.

Discussions were had regarding Westchester County approval for this application. The applicant was aware of this.

The applicant was advised to go before the Conservation Board and stake the wetlands on site.

## **TENT LEGISLATION**

### **Referral from the Town Board**

#### **Discussion**

#### **Recommendation to Town Board**

Mr. Kaufman stated that this was a referral from the Town Board to the Planning Board. This is a request to modify the zoning code. The Town Board is looking to amend the definition of a structure within the town code to explicitly not regulate tents in terms of zoning. Whenever a tent is erected it will not have to meet setbacks, FAR, GLC or off street parking requirements. They will need to comply with the state building code which is reflected in the legislation. Tents are not permitted within the front yard; this applies to tents in excess of 200 square feet. The tents are only permitted 6 months a year per the state building code.

Mr. Carthy understood that the board is only voting on the definition of a structure as it relates to a tent. Mr. Baroni noted that 6 months is in the state code and if the town wants something more stringent than what the state building code of 6 months is, the town would have to go before the state board and get approval before you can enforce it. This happened with the sprinkler law and it was never passed. Mr. Carthy noted that

he thought six months might be excessive for our town. Perhaps 3 days or two weeks would be appropriate amount of time for a tent to be up, he asked if this has ever been a problem. Mr. Sauro inquired if there should be a difference in the amount of time a tent could be up residentially vs. commercially. Mr. Baroni stated that there has not been an issue with this residentially.

The remainder of the board had no objections to the proposed legislation.

Mr. Sauro asked for a motion for a positive recommendation to the Town Board regarding the tent legislation as drafted. Mr. Carthy made a motion to approve. It was second by Mr. Pollack and approved with four Ayes. Mr. Delano was not present.

**McMANUS**  
**19 Glendale Avenue**  
**108.01-5-51**  
**2-Lot Subdivision**  
**Mark P. Miller, Esq. Veneziano & Associates**  
**Consideration of 2<sup>nd</sup> Extension of Time Resolution**

The application involves the subdivision of an existing 12,383 square foot lot into two residential building lots of equal size.

Mr. Pollack made a motion to grant the extension of time request. Mr. Jensen second the motion and it was approved with four Ayes. Mr. Delano was not present for the vote.

**9 & 3 SADDLE COURT**  
**9 & 3 Saddle Court**  
**95.02-1-33**  
**Lot Line Change**  
**Scott Gray, LS Thomas Merritts Land Surveyors, P.C.**  
**Discussion**  
**Consideration of preliminary and final subdivision extension of time resolutions**

The subject application involves a land exchange between 9 and 3 Saddle Court so that the pool and appurtenances associated with Lot 33 is entirely located on Lot 33.

Mr. Pollack made a motion to grant the extension of time request. Mr. Jensen second the motion and it was approved with four Ayes. Mr. Delano was not present for the vote.

**1 BYRAM BROOK PLACE**

**1 Byram Brook Place**

**108.03- 3- 76**

**Amended site plan approval – Parking Expansion**

**Bob Roth, PE, CPESC, Principal John Meyer Consulting**

**Paul Sysak, RLA, ASLA Project Manager John Meyer Consulting**

**Discussion**

**Recommendation to Town Board regarding Bonds for site work and wetland mitigation**

The Applicant is seeking approval for “after the fact” site plan approval to convert the office building to office and medical office, to expand the existing parking lot by 17 spaces, to construct a retaining wall, install landscaping, lighting and drainage improvements as well as conduct parking lot restriping (with 28 of the off-street parking spaces proposed as compact car parking). The board will be voting on two bonds this evening, site improvements and wetland mitigation with a five year monitoring plan.

Mr. Baroni noted he had received and read the memo from Paul Sysak regarding the letter of credit for his client. He stated that the Town cannot take the bond from the contractor because the Town has no relationship with the contractor, if the money needs to be collected, the town won't get the money. The applicant has three choices, a bond, letter of credit or cash.

Mr. Baroni will report back to Mr. Sysak.

Mr. Sauro made a motion to positively recommend both bonds which include site improvements and wetland mitigation with a five year monitoring plan. Mr. Carthy made a motion to approve. It was second by Mr. Pollack and approved with four Ayes. Mr. Delano was not present.

**COCKREN AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

**22 Old Route 22**

**Section 107.04, Block 2, Lot 15**

**Lou Larizza, Lazz Development**

**Nathaniel Holt, PE**

**Discussion of Field Change**

The material requested by the town engineer from the applicants engineer has not been provided to date and until this information is provided, the Town Engineer is not able to sign off on the field change. This matter will be placed on the September 26, 2016 Planning Board agenda provided the material is submitted.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.