

**TOWN OF NORTH CASTLE**

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**15 Bedford Road**

**Armonk, New York 10504**

**April 26, 2010**

**7:00 p.m.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Peg Michelman, Chairman

John Delano

Steve Sauro

Jane Black

Beata Tatka

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Adam Kaufman

Town Planner

Roland A. Baroni, Jr., Esq. Town Counsel

Stephens, Baroni, Reilly & Lewis, LLP

Ryan Coyne, P.E.

Kellard Sessions Consulting, P.C.

Consulting Town Engineers

Valerie Desimone

Planning Board Secretary

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

*April 12, 2010*

Ms. Black moved to approve the minutes from the April 12<sup>th</sup> meeting as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Delano and unanimously approved.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**MJ LACAV**

**Site Plan**

**Section 2, Block 16, Lot II.B05**

**125 Business Park Drive**

**Barry Naderman, PE**

**Discussion**

**Consideration of approving Special Use Permit Resolution**

Chairman Michelman read the public notice for the record. Ms. Desimone noted that 6 out of 7 cards were returned and that all paperwork was in order. Chairman Michelman asked if there were any neighbors present for this application. There were none.

Mr. Michael Labriola was present for this application. Chairman Michelman noted that this application had been approved previously and that nothing has changed. The approvals lapsed and the applicant had to reapply to get updated approvals. She reiterated that nothing has changed since the original approval.

Chairman Michelman asked if Mr. Labriola had looked at the resolution. He said that he had, and had no issues.

Mr. Delano moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Black and unanimously approved.

Mr. Delano noted minor corrections, which Mr. Kaufman noted. Ms. Black moved to approve the resolution as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Delano and unanimously approved.

**GODNER**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Amended Special Use Permit Application**

**Section 2, Block 1F, Lot 2.A**

**11 Whipoorwill Crossing**

**David Graham - David Graham Architects**

**Discussion**

**Consideration of approving Special Use Permit Resolution**

Chairman Michelman read the public notice for the record. Ms. Desimone noted that 10 out of 10 cards were returned and that all paperwork was in order. Chairman Michelman asked if there were any neighbors present for this application. Mr. Tom Flanagan of 1 Deer Trail was present.

Mr. David Graham was present on behalf of the applicant. Chairman Michelman asked if Mr. Flanagan wanted to ask anything. Mr. Flanagan said that he reviewed the plans and Mr. Godner has built a beautiful home. He noted that the site was very close to the maximum land coverage and given how close he is, Mr. Flanagan wanted to know if there is a physical inspection that is

done to ensure that the applicant builds in accord with the drawings. He said that he has noticed that the plans don't indicate that there are stone pillars, and there are four on this driveway. It makes him wonder what else is on the property that is not accounted for. Mr. Kaufman said that the Board has asked the applicant to submit the calculations used to come to a total and they require sign and seal of their professional, and then the building department will require an as built survey after they review the work on the site. The building department will do a field inspection.

Mr. Flanagan wanted to know what happened if the actual construction didn't match up with the plans when the field inspection was done. Mr. Kaufman explained that they would either have to come back to this Board and try and rectify it, or remove the problem. Mr. Flanagan wanted to know if there was a higher level of certainty since the applicant was so close to the maximum. Mr. Kaufman explained that the Chairman usually stresses that point, and cautions them to build exactly what is proposed and approved.

Mr. Flanagan said he wasn't aware that the town allows a bonus gross maximum figure. This lot sits between two houses that are on other roads. The issue isn't how much the setback from the front, but from the sides because the houses are very close together. From the back of his property, he said he can see the backs of his neighbors' houses. The side of the property is something the Board should take into account. Mr. Kaufman explained that the side yard setbacks are codified so in order to change it, it would require a code change.

Chairman Michelman asked if there were any other comments. Mr. Kaufman pointed out that the applicant was not adding any more mass or building or floor area. They were talking about the expansion of the driveway and rear patio. The previous approval had grass in front of the last garage bay, and this will pave it over 173 sq. ft. Mr. Graham explained that the patio will increase in size; this was done at the suggestion of the landscape architect. In the process of the construction, the patio was damaged, so this will repair it and increase the size and reconfigure it slightly. Mr. Graham added that they were also proposing a stonewall to block the air conditioning unit.

Chairman Michelman asked how visible it would be to the neighbors. Mr. Graham said that the driveway was on grade and nothing was being done to the façade. The rebuilt terrace is basically what it was before, but shifted back approximately 10'. Mr. Flanagan said that the applicant put up a stockade fence, so it was not visible to him.

Mr. Flanagan asked if this work has already been done and Mr. Graham said that it had not. Chairman Michelman noted that this would have been easier for everyone if this would have all been done at once.

Mr. Sauro asked the status of the second story additions and screening for that. Mr. Graham said that there is an improved landscaping plan, but it is a work in progress. They are going to try and get this planting done in the late spring.

Mr. Sauro asked if the Town Engineer was satisfied with the fourth garage bay. Mr. Graham said that it was 24' deep, which is a satisfactory garage bay. Mr. Coyne said that he has not looked at that issue. Mr. Sauro said that if a future owner wanted to put in a car in that 4<sup>th</sup> bay, they might just pave a little more and that might get them over the maximum allowable limit. Mr.

Graham said he thought there was enough room to back out.

Ms. Tatka asked about the pillars Mr. Flanagan spoke about. Mr. Graham said that they are not shown on the plan.

Mr. Flanagan noted that there were some trees removed from the rear of the property because that is where the septic was installed. Some were removed from their side of the property. Mr. Graham said that he'd look into this. Mr. Godner said that the septic field was moved to be nearer the Flanagan property per the Westchester County Health Department's directive.

Chairman Michelman asked if the Flanagan's had seen the resolution. They said they had. Chairman noted that the applicant would not be able to move forward until all of the many conditions are met

The Conservation Board representative asked Mr. Graham to point out the wetland buffer line and Mr. Graham did.

Chairman Michelman asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none.

Ms. Black moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Delano and unanimously approved.

Mr. Delano pointed out some corrections, and Mr. Kaufman made a note.

Mr. Delano moved to approve the resolution as amended. The motion was seconded by Ms. Black and unanimously approved.

### **DISCUSSION:**

**CALDER CENTER – FORDHAM UNIVERSITY**  
**Amended Site Plan**  
**Section 2, Block 1, Lot 8**  
**31 Whippoorwill Road**  
**Joe Modafferri, RLA - John Meyer Consulting, P.C.**  
**Discussion**

Mr. Joseph Modafferri was present on behalf of the applicant along with M. John Spacarelli of the University and Mr. Ken Batemen, the architect.

Mr. Modafferri explained that the applicant was seeking approval to amend a previous approval for log cabins for student housing. The prior approval was for two cabins, each housing six students. The applicant would like to amend the approval to have one, two-story cabin to house all twelve students. This essentially conforms to the previous approval. They have tried to reduce the impacts to the surrounding areas.

Mr. Modafferri presented a landscaping plan, and indicated where the two story cabin would be, and where the one cabins had been. He explained that the parking would now be in the place of the one story cabin that had been removed. The other area where cabin had been proposed will

have the two story cabin. Mr. Modafferri added that this has been taken out of the limit of disturbance.

It is the same 3,800 sq. ft. of living space that was within the two cabins. It still includes the greenhouse, and the pavement they are proposing has been reduced from approximately 1,500 sq. ft. to 1,400 sq. ft. The overall granular pavement has been reduced by roughly 4,600 sq. ft. There is an overall decrease in impervious surface of 4,700 sq. ft. The total disturbance is approximately one acre less. The wetland buffer disturbance is approximately 1,100 sq. ft. less and they are removing 15 fewer trees.

The septic system remains the same. The applicant has received approval from the DEP and the Health Department. The fields basically stayed the same, as did the stormwater management system. Even though they are reducing the impervious surface, they kept the stormwater basins the same.

Chairman Michelman said that the Board would like to get this done and they understood the applicant's economic concerns, but to her, the two story design takes a lot warmth and rustic feeling out. She asked if the second story would visible to any of the neighbors. Mr. Modafferri did not think so; it is more than 300' to the roadway, and the area is all wooded with changes in topography. He thought that the two-story fits better with the other two story structures on the site.

Chairman Michelman said that the Board has been advised that because the application has been revised significantly, it has to go back to the ARB. Mr. Baroni noted that this site has a special use permit from the Town Board and in his opinion these revisions were different enough to require the applicant to go back to the Town Board to get an amended special use permit. Mr. Modafferri thought this was something he should discuss with Mr. Baroni. Mr. Baroni said that was fine, and he pointed out that the Town Board might have no objection, but this had to go back for their discussion and approval. A new public hearing would be required.

Ms. Black asked if it should it go back to the ARB first so that the Town Board could have the benefit of that feedback. The Board thought that would be beneficial.

Mr. Delano thought that that this was an overall improvement in terms of disturbance and carbon footprint and he thought it would probably be well received. However, the process had to be followed.

Ms. Black said she was not opposed to this. Chairman Michelman said that she was not necessarily opposed to it either, but would have liked to have seen the more rustic look that the other proposal would have offered.

Mr. Bateman presented an elevation of the building as proposed. He explained the site and thought that this would be close to invisible.

Mr. Sauro noted Mr. Kaufman's comment regarding the staircases being open to the outside. Mr. Bateman said that one is, and they thought it added to the rustic character of the building. There is another stairway inside. If this was to be done inside as well, it would increase the coverage, and it would really make the façade blank.

Mr. Modafferri said that with respect to the parking comment, it is essentially the same distance from the previous plan – approximately 70'. Chairman Michelman noted that there was a question from Mr. Kaufman about guest parking. Mr. Modafferri – thought that was raised at the original application. He noted that this is really a walking campus and there is plenty of other parking throughout the campus. There is the requisite number of spaces under the code. The ten spaces they are providing now are consistent with the number they were providing on the previous plan when they were presenting two buildings. He thought this Board previously accepted the guest parking.

Mr. Modafferri noted that this is considered the R2 zone, and it is considered a dormitory. The applicant is required to put sprinklers inside, and that is what really put this project over budget. They understood the eighth comment and they have been discussing the issue with the Building Department.

Ms. Black asked what would happen if they had twelve non-handicapped students in the building, and they didn't have enough parking because ten are regular spaces, and two handicapped. Mr. Modafferri reiterated that there is parking elsewhere on campus. There is a plan in the package that shows that the parking on the campus is more than adequate. Ms. Black said that if she was one of the two students who didn't get a regular space, she would be annoyed at having to walk that far, especially in the winter or at night. Mr. Modafferri said that it is the same 10 spaces that were being proposed previously on the plan the Board approved. He added that these students are not the type to have a problem with walking additional distances. Mr. Sauro saw Ms. Black's point. He thought there should be twelve spaces, one per student in addition to the handicapped spaces. Mr. Modafferri said they would look into this.

Ms. Tatka did not see a problem at all with the ten spaces.

Mr. Modafferri said that with respect to Mr. Coyne's comment regarding drainage for the green house, they are proposing to put in cisterns to capture the drainage. Mr. Coyne wanted the drainage to go to a different place so they will connect all the systems to the overflow pipe so that all of the drainage from the greenhouse does go where Mr. Coyne wants it to go.

Chairman Michelman said that the first step was for the applicant to go to the ARB and then to the Town Board to deal with the possibility of an amended special use permit.

Mr. Modafferri asked if they could work with this Board to get on the next possible agenda after the Town Board meeting, assuming everything goes well. The Board said that was fine, and that a resolution could be prepared for the same night assuming everything goes well.

The Conservation Board representative asked if the detention basin could be reduced in size. Mr. Modafferri said that technically it could, but the applicant is trying to provide additional mitigation and trying to save some money to build this project. They are hopeful that this would be acceptable to the Board. The Conservation Board representative thought it would be cheaper to have the smaller basin and Mr. Modafferri said that it would not be, since they would have to redesign it, and have it reviewed. It is cheaper and easier to leave it as is. Mr. Modafferri added that Mr. Coyne thought the additional mitigation was beneficial.

John Spacarelli with the University thanked the Board. He noted that when this project first started approximately three years ago, the first concept was the three log cabins. When it was on paper, it took up more property then they wanted. That is why they reduced it two cabins. After that was designed, they found they had to put the sprinkler system in, and that is what caused the biggest problem. It was going to be very expensive, so they are seeking the amended approval for only one cabin. They would like to get this done quickly.

Mr. Spacarelli said that in his opinion, the special use permit allows the applicant to build this and house 12 students. They thought the best thing to do is to have all 12 under one roof. Chairman Michelman did not think this would be a problem. Mr. Spacarelli said that this process was going to put them back another two or three months. Mr. Baroni said that it might, but because the plan has morphed to what it is, the legislative body (the Town Board) has the right to review the plan to make sure it is in keeping with what they originally thought was going to happen. It is a process that needs to be followed.

Mr. Modafferri noted that they have significantly reduced the impacts, and asked if there was any reason why they would have to go back to the Conservation Board and Mr. Kaufman said it was not necessary.

Mr. Baroni asked if this Board felt it had enough information to advance a recommendation to the Town Board. If so, it would significantly reduce the time. The Board felt that they did in that all the improvements were positive.

Ms. Black moved to send a positive recommendation to the Town Board subject to the applicant's addressing any ARB comments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Delano and unanimously approved.

**LANDER**  
**Special Use Permit Accessory Apartment**  
**Section 2, Block 12, Lot 4.1**  
**24 School Street**  
**Bill O'Neill, RA - O'Neill Architects**  
**Discussion**

Mr. Bill O'Neill was present on behalf of the applicants together with the applicants themselves. He explained that the applicants were seeking approval for an accessory apartment and other special use permits for FAR gross land coverage.

The apartment will be used for the applicant's mother (a widow who would like to sell her large home in Bedford and come live in Armonk with her daughter). Mr. O'Neill presented a site plan and indicated the existing garage. The application proposes to remove the garage. They will add a small section to the wrap around porch, which will lead to a new entrance. The lot is adjacent to wetland but there is no wetland on site. Mr. O'Neill indicated the buffer line, which includes the entire existing house and almost 70-80% of the lot itself. Everything that is being proposed is in the buffer. There is an existing deck, and the applicant will be reducing the size of the deck. There is a variance that exists for the deck from 1986.

Chairman Michelman said that the Board walked the site and other than knocking the garage down and adding an entrance, all the work is in the back. Mr. O'Neill agreed and added that there is a degree of privacy and separation. The accessory apartment will have an entrance to the house itself and to the outside.

Chairman Michelman noted that there was a comment that the Wetland Consultant has to view the site. Mr. O'Neill said that they were fine with most of the comments. He recognized that this had to go to the Conservation Board and the ARB. He explained that he was in the process of dealing with the NYS wetland permit. They have not done the topography yet – but they need to do it to get the exact location of the flood plain line. They are working on it and will get the information to the Board before the next time on the agenda.

Mr. O'Neill said that they will show the three spaces as requested. The timelines for the accessory apartment are not an issue as the applicants have owned the house since 1986.

With respect to the stormwater mitigation comment in Mr. Coyne's memo, Mr. O'Neill said that they will provide deep tests and perc tests that Mr. Coyne will witness. Mr. O'Neill added that he will absolutely define that the storage area is not a garage in keeping with Mr. Coyne's request.

With respect to the mitigation plan, it will be difficult to achieve the 2:1 mitigation. There is approximately 1,800 sq. ft. of disturbance. Mr. Kaufman said that they should do as much as they can do; the Board recognizes there are limitations on this site. They do not expect the applicant's entire back yard to be mitigation area; they know the applicants want some lawn area. Mr. O'Neill said that he would work on a plan and then go to the Conservation Board.

The Conservation Board representative asked if there were any changes in the impervious area. Mr. O'Neill said that there was; they were adding 1,800 sq. ft of additional impervious area, both driveway and building. He reiterated that the work being proposed was entirely in the buffer area because the site itself was almost entirely in the buffer.

## **ZENG**

### **Site Plan**

**Section 2, Block 17, Lot 2G-1**

**46 N. Greenwich Road**

**Walter Nestler, Landscape Architect, ASLA**

### **Discussion**

Mr. John Woodriff and Walter Nestler were present for the application together with the applicant himself. Mr. Woodriff explained that the applicant was seeking approval to construct a new home on this property. There was a house on the site previously, but it has been torn down. It is approximately 3.5 acres with a man made pond.

The new house will be approximately 4,700 sq. ft. with an 800 sq. ft. garage. This is in the wetland buffer. The house is approximately 73' from the front of Greenwich Road. There are two curb cuts now and the applicant will have a one curb cut circular driveway. They have approval

for septic system (indicated). Mr. Woodriff indicated where the house would be located and explained the applicant would have a walk out basement.

The house will be relatively low, with the first floor of the house at street elevation. It will be colonial in style. Mr. Woodriff presented an architectural rendering and elevation. The house is approximately 32' deep and 100' wide, including the garage. There is also an approximately 2,000 sq. ft. basement, which they do not propose to finish now and a 1,500 sq. ft. attic. The roof will be a 9/12 pitch to reduce the appearance from the street. They are planning to do heavy planting in the front of the house to screen it.

Mr. Woodriff added that this will be a geothermal house and will have close to a zero carbon footprint. They will make the requested changes to the zoning charts.

Ms. Black noted that there are four rooms identified as bedrooms, but it is a five bedroom house with two other rooms that could be considered bedrooms. She asked the applicant to indicate which would be the fifth bedroom. Mr. Woodriff indicated. Mr. Coyne noted that the Health Department might consider a particular room as a bedroom. Mr. Woodriff said that they have approval for a five bedroom; the Health Department considered the playroom a fifth bedroom and not the den in the downstairs.

Mr. Woodriff added that they have received approval from the ARB. Chairman Michelman noted that it was conditional approval based upon comments from Conservation Board and this Board.

Chairman Michelman asked the applicant to talk about the mitigation and planting plan. Mr. Nestler presented plans to the Board and indicated the manmade pond, the wetland buffer and the wetlands. This will have approximately 5,400 sq. ft of disturbance. He pointed out on the plan where they plan to do mitigation and what would be lawn. They will remove invasive trees and shrubs and produce a wildlife meadow. The bulk of the mitigation takes care of the buffer, but there is still approximately 2,100 sq. ft. left. They are considering going into the wetland itself and doing something similar (clear out invasive species and provide a wetland seed mix). They are going to work with the Conservation Board on that. There will be a split rail fence that will define the lawn area from the meadow. The geothermal field is located in a particular area with lawn over it.

The original proposal had also included a swimming pool. This was kept outside the old buffer. The initial comments from the RPRC were that the pool might not be a good idea. That is why they came back with revised drawings. He indicated the plan with the square footages on the site. He presented a planting plan, consisting of mostly evergreens. They are extending the planting down the southern side of the property. The existing stone wall straddles the lot – some on this property and some on neighbors. The applicant is only planning to remove the trees necessary to build the house, driveway and septic field.

In the attempt to provide some options, they developed three options for stormwater mitigation. Option #2 was to put everything into drywells and recharger units. This will be dependent on the tests. If it works then they will be able to do this option. Option #3, was to use the driveway runoff and create a rain garden. However, that would have to be located in the wetland itself. The other option (#1) was to keep the driveway and walks and 1/3 of the roof water and putting it into a particular system and the rest into the existing cistern. Mr. Nestler thought that everyone

seemed to think that Option #1 made the most sense.

There are only a few spotty existing steep slopes, but they will be creating some steep slopes in one particular area. That is where they have the most planting proposed. Mr. Nestler said that they are going to protect the two existing cedar trees and they were also going to try and preserve the existing Japanese maple tree. That will require him to realign the driveway.

Chairman Michelman noted that they still had a few extra square feet on the mitigation. Mr. Nestler recognized that and said that they will probably go through the entire property and remove all the vines on the trees. We have begun some of that removal on the site already, doing it manually.

Ms. Black asked if the applicant discussed going into the wetland with the Conservation Board. Mr. Nestler said that it was discussed during the site walk, and they were currently in discussions.

Chairman Michelman asked if there were any other issues. Mr. Kaufman said that they had mostly been discussed. The Board doesn't seem to have an issue with the size or mass of the house.

Mr. Coyne asked if the applicant applied for a waiver from the Health Department to be allowed to keep the trees in the expansion field. Mr. Nestler said they had not yet, but they would if they had to. Mr. Delano said that it has been his experience that the Health Department will tell the applicant to begin the work, and then apply for a waiver. Mr. Coyne said he was concerned that part of the mitigation is keeping the trees, and he did not know if the county would allow that. Mr. Nestler said they would begin talking to the county on this issue.

Chairman Michelman asked the next step and Mr. Coyne said the applicant needed to talk to the Health Department and Mr. Kaufman said that the Board would await the Conservation Board's memo.

Ms. Black noted that this was a relatively large house, and kind of close to the road but she appreciated that the applicant lowered the roof line and added significant screening. She said that mitigates it for her.

## **COCHRAN MIDDLE INCOME HOUSES**

### **Site Plan**

**Section 2, Block 15, Lot 1**

**22 Old Route 22**

**Nathaniel J. Holt, PE - Holt Engineering & Consulting**

### **Discussion**

Mr. Peter Monteleone and Mr. William McClure were present for the application. Mr. McClure presented a site plan for the Board. He explained that they were proposing to build 10 middle income units (MIU's) as a resolution for Cider Mill town houses. This would be the off site MIU's that were required during that approval.

The property is in the sewer and water district. Mr. Monteleone would be the general contractor and Mr. Holt would be the engineer. Mr. McClure said that he was a member of the team and he has read some of the comments and does not see any issue. In the general comments, they had a question about the pedestrian link. Mr. Kaufman explained that the Board was not asking them to construct the sidewalk all the way up to Whippoorwill Ridge, only that the applicant build sidewalks in front of their property. Mr. Kaufman said this was an opportune time for the Planning Board to begin considering a plan for Route 22, and ultimately connecting to that sidewalk. The Board thought they should consider the future of this street.

Mr. Monteleone said that there had been a question about additional parking. They would be able to do that in a particular area, if they were permitted to go back a little more. The alternative would be to have it in the front. Mr. Kaufman thought that on-street parking might be appropriate, and they might be able to get more off street parking. There are no zoning requirements in that area, so to add more spaces in the rear would be a good idea.

Mr. McClure said that the property had been the site of the substantial single family residence and a lawn mower shop. There are no trees on this site. Additionally, the comment that 50% of the property be open space would be beneficial to the applicant.

Mr. Kaufman said that the application does a good job of getting the units in and laying out the site plan. They might need ZBA approval for one car garage parking and also if they did not meet 50% open space issue. Mr. Kaufman said he did not see where they would be able to get the 50%.

Mr. Kaufman said that he liked this design better than what the alternative would have been, which would have been garage at grade for each unit. That would have been a three story appearance with a string of garage doors, and 10 separate curb cuts. The Board thought this was a nice and attractive plan. Mr. Monteleone presented a photo of what the units would look like. They would be in clusters of five.

Mr. McClure said that the Town Engineer has been working with the applicant's engineer and they would work together on the issues contained in the Town Engineer's memo.

Chairman Michelman said that the applicant would need a lot of referrals (to the ARB, the Sewer and Water approval, and the ZBA for the garages, and possibly the 50% open space). She added that the applicant should go to the housing board and per Mr. Kaufman's memo consider adding a third bedroom to some of the units. The Board thought that issue should be discussed with the housing board. Mr. McClure said that they have had conversations with the housing board, and the only comment was that they had no interest in one bedroom or studio units. Chairman Michelman said that the Board needed something in writing from the housing board on the three bedroom issue.

Mr. Kaufman asked if the applicant was going to provide revised real floor plans. Mr. Monteleone said that they would. Mr. McClure said that now that they know the process was moving along, they would provide floor plans.

Mr. Kaufman asked if the applicant had any concerns regarding moving the washer and dryers to the basement and Mr. Monteleone said it would not be a problem. Mr. Kaufman asked if they would add fences in the rear for privacy and Mr. Monteleone said they would. Mr. Kaufman asked if they would provide underground utilities and Mr. Monteleone said they would. Mr. Kaufman asked that the applicant submit these things on your next site plan as well as the calculations for the open space.

Mr. Kaufman said that the next time the applicant submits to the Board, they will know exactly how much of a variance they will need. At that point the Board would refer them to the ZBA. In the meantime, the applicant should go to the ARB and the housing board and get their comments. The Board would refer it to the fire and police departments as well as the Sewer and Water Department. Mr. Kaufman said that this was an unlisted action and the Board should declare intent to be lead agency.

Mr. Delano moved to declare intent to be lead agency. The motion was seconded by Ms. Black and unanimously approved.

Mr. Kaufman and the Board thought this was a nice plan and was a good starting point. They also agreed that it was much better than the original concept for the site.

\*\*\*\*\*

The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*