

Planning Board  
Village of Tarrytown  
Regular Meeting  
September 28, 2015; 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Members Tedesco, Aukland, Raiselis, Birgy; Counsel Zalantis; Village Administrator Blau; Village Engineer McGarvey; Secretary Bellantoni

ABSENT: Chairman Friedlander

Mr. Tedesco chaired the meeting in Chairman Friedlander's absence.

#### ADJOURNMENTS:

##### Continuations of a Public Hearing:

- 67 Miller Avenue – Bartolacci
- 25 Main Street – HKP Realty Inc.
- 112 Wilson Park Drive (lot 2) – Toll Brothers
- 105 Deertrack Lane - Kasoff

##### Continuations of a Preliminary Presentation:

- 61 Gracemere – Split Development Corp.

#### CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING – Hanley – 73 High Street

William Robb, the applicant's attorney and Mr. Zendman were present. Mr. Zendman said he was asked by the Court to submit plans to the Planning Board, which they did.

Mr. Tedesco said the board is asking you to build your wall on your property, do you have such a plan. Mr. Zendman said we have submitted that plan. Mr. McGarvey said no you have not. The last plan I have showed a wall on your property and on the Islamic Society's property. I do not see a plan for the removal of the wall. Mr. Zendman said the Judge told us to have plans to build the wall drawn up to present to the planning board so that we could remediate this problem. We were not told to have plans for the removal of that section of the wall that is not in our property.

Mr. McGarvey said you constructed the wall that is there without a permit. Mr. Zendman said that is right; we are asking the board for more time to pursue another Avenue so that we will not have to remove the wall. He said we have a letter saying it is safe and as the Building Inspector you should be able to tell if it is safe. Mr. McGarvey said I cannot tell if a wall is safe if I don't know how it was built. He said the letter you are referring to (Mr. McGarvey read the letter and it is attached) states that the wall is not designed and built according to New York standards but it is not in danger of immediate collapse. Mr. McGarvey said as the Building Inspector he cannot allow the wall to remain when your engineer states that it was not built according to New York State Building Code. Mr. Zendman said we are appealing to the Planning Board. Mr.

McGarvey said the Planning Board is the wrong board to appeal by decision; the appeal should be to the Zoning Board.

Counsel Zalantis said the wall is outside your property line. The Village would like to see a wall within your property line.

Mr. Robb said the wall that was built last year repaired a wall that was there for 20 years.

Mr. Raiselis asked Mr. Zendman if they spoke to the neighbors to tell them you were building on their property. Mr. Robb said his client did not know that the wall wasn't on their property.

Mr. Tedesco said he knows they have gone to the Islamic Society asking to purchase the portion of their property that has the wall on it, and they have refused to sell their property. Did you ask them for their permission to go on their property to build that section of the wall that is on their property? Mr. Robb feels that is the best solution. Mr. Tedesco said and they should be pleased that you are repairing the wall.

Mr. Blau said the Zoning Board is not involved in determining if something is in compliance to the Building Code; it is either compliant or non-compliant. Mr. McGarvey said you would have to appeal to New York State for a waiver to keep that wall. Mr. Robb agreed with Mr. McGarvey. Mr. Robb said if the board agrees, we will pursue getting permission to build the wall on the Church's property and submit for a building permit to do the remediation or reconstruction properly; that is our intention.

Mr. Zendman said to Mr. McGarvey that at an earlier meeting he did submit plans to remediate the wall on our property as well as on the neighbor's property. The board seems to be ready to approve those plans when it was brought up that part of the wall was not on our property, so I believe you do have plans to remediate that wall. Mr. McGarvey said he believe that all of the plans that he does have show the wall on the adjacent property. He said when you take down the wall on the adjacent property, you will have to extend the leg of the retaining walls along the east side of the property line because that wall is presently holding back dirt that you are now going to need to be held back on your property. These plans are going to have to be revised.

Ms. Raiselis said doesn't the existing wall on the other property extend your yard. Mr. Zendman said yes. Ms. Raiselis said so that is part of the problem. You need to make sure you are on your own property. Speak to your neighbors and explain your unintentional slight breach of their property. Mr. Robb said, again, this was a replacement of an existing wall.

Counsel Zalantis asked if the board wants elevation and a landscape plan. Mr. Zendman said we already did that. Ms. Raiselis said maybe they need to be modified.

Mr. Tedesco opened the meeting to the public.

Ahmed Goma, member of the Islamic Cultural Center of New York said the Mr. Zendman approached us to buy a piece of our property. We are a not-for-profit organization and we cannot do anything without going before the Assembly. Our discussion the request and review the plans and decided that they did not want to sell any portion of the property. Ms. Raiselis said they would like your permission to go onto your property to fix the wall so that it is only on their property. Mr. Goma said he does not feel that will be a problem as long as the wall stays on their property; however, it has to be submitted to the Assembly.

Abdellatif Zureaqi, Member of the Islamic Cultural Center of New York said when they rebuilt the wall they did not approach us, like we didn't exist. If the Village did not find the violation, we never would have found out. We tried to convince the Assembly to keep the wall, but they rejected it. It is our property and we have a right to it. We will not allow anything on our property; and if it taken down, it has to be done by him. Mr. Tedesco said they are not going to build on your property; they just want to go on your property to take the wall down. Mr. McGarvey said he is going to need permission to go on your property to take the wall down; and if he does not get that permission the Islamic Center will have to take out the building permit to take the wall down. Mr. Blau said you do not want to incur the cost of removing the wall. If you don't give him permission to go on your property, you will have to remove it. In order for him to incur the cost, you have to give him permission to go on your property to remove it.

Counsel Zalantis said you should speak with the Islamic Center and come to an agreement. You should provide them with insurance to protect the Islamic Center and remove the wall at no cost to them.

Mr. Robb said he first got involved with this because Mr. Zendman had showed him pictures, documentation and surveys which, in his estimation, show continuous, open and notorious, hostile use of the property which would grant him the right of adverse position as owner of the property. He said he only brought this up because his client may have some rights to maintain that property. Mr. Robb said they have had discussion with the property owners and documents provided; they have been notified of that position. We had hoped to avoid spending the money on legal fees and court fees and to spend it on just transferring the title of that limited strip, but it doesn't look like that is an option at this point. He said he just wanted to make the board aware of the other issue that is going on. Mr. Blau asked if you pursue this, what kind of timeframe are you looking at; because the board is hoping to resolve this. Mr. Robb said any legal issue take anywhere from 6 months to a year. He said he is working toward an agreeable solution, which is what he would prefer; but at the same time he is keeping his client informed of his legal rights.

Mr. Zureaqi said if he is going to take us to court, which they have threaten us to do, if anything happens, if anyone gets hurt or anything gets damaged, he will be 100% his responsibility. They did it without our permission and I am putting him on notice.

Mr. Tedesco said that Mr. Zendman should explain to the Islamic Center and make it clear exactly what you want to do and how it is good for them; and hopefully when you come back to this board, we will have a resolution.

Mr. Tedesco moved, continued by Mr. Aukland to continue the public hearing; all in favor. Motion carried.

#### CONTINUATION OF A PUBLIC HEARING – NY Dealer Stations – 372 South Broadway

Leo Napior of Harfenist Kraut & Perlstein LLP was present on behalf of the applicant as well as Frank Filiciotto, Traffic Consultant with Stonefield Engineering. Mr. Napior said they did attend the last staff meeting, they received the final traffic report from VHB and Andrea Connell of VHB is here with us tonight. He said they plans have not changed nor have they submitted any additional information. He said he would be happy to speak to any questions the board may have.

Mr. Tedesco said at the staff meeting we asked you to do some traffic counts in various locations and at various times of the day. Mr. Napior said they did complete those traffic counts and he turned the floor over to Mr. Filiciotto to address those issues.

Mr. Filiciotto said they did do traffic counts last Thursday, September 24, 2015 at three peak times:

- Early: 7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.
- Mid: 11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
- Late: 4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

He said he spoke with John Canning of VHB and he agreed that traffic counts are a good ideal. They collected seven hours of data. Midday was the most active time for both the driveway into the shopping center and into the gas station. The majority of the traffic was from cars coming onto the property from the shopping center. At peak hours, the number of cars was fewer than 10 vehicles, 9 to be exact. The number of vehicles from the driveway to be closed was also 9. This is not an overwhelming amount of cars.

Mr. Blau said at the staff meeting they were asked if there is an easement or cross easement between the gas station and the shopping center. Mr. Napior said they are still waiting on that information; they should have a response in the next week or so.

Mr. Filiciotto said they received accident report from Chief Scott Brown. The data showed 24 accidents over three years, from early 2012 to early 2015 at the intersection of Route 119 and Route 9 in front of the Shell station. He stated that over half were rear-end accidents. He believes the board is more concerned about vehicles coming out of the site and heading south. There was only one accident where the vehicle back-up into a car.

Ms. Raiselis said but rear-end accidents could also have occurred by a car stopping short because a car was coming out of that driveway. Mr. Filiciotto said more were from slippery road conditions. He said you are right but none indicated if they were caused by cars coming out of that driveway.

Mr. Aukland said most of the traffic is not from this property but from the surrounding property. It will be worse once the new bridge is finished. He asked if they would agree to look at the traffic problem in that area with the village and getting the DOT involved. It seems what you are proposing is better than what is there now.

Ms. Connell spoke with Mr. Filiciotto and Mr. Napier. They have done some traffic counts and we would like to see some comparisons. We do find that by closing down one driveway is a good thing; just eliminating one driveway is a good thing. Counsel Zalantis asked Ms. Connell if they would like to review those traffic counts. Ms. Connell said yes they would and they will get them from them.

Mr. Tedesco said he agrees with David that this is better than what is there presently. He said there are two things; John Canning's office would like to see the traffic counts and make a comparison of what is there now and what is going to happen in the future and secondly to get some information on that cross action easement. He feels that they should continue this to the next meeting until we get that information.

Ms. Raiselis said the biggest concern is people exiting onto Route 119 and cutting across two lanes to go south on Broadway. Eliminate that driveway is better but maybe VHB can take another look at the entire site plan and look at a better way than cutting across two lanes. Ms. Connell said they will look at that. The accident data will give us more information. We will take a closer look. Ms. Raiselis said for what is there and what they have to work with, the landscape plan is good and they are doing a good job. This is just a problematic intersection and we want to make it as good as possible.

Mr. Aukland said the traffic is so slow moving that accidents are probably not the issues; cutting across is the issue. Mr. Birgy said you only have to cut across one lane because there are two left-turn lanes.

Mr. Napier asked this board if they could declare a negative declaration because they have an application before the Zoning Board which they cannot make a determination on until this board does a SEQR determination.

Ms. Raiselis said but doesn't the traffic review determine our determination. Counsel Zalantis said it's up to you and your consultants. If you don't feel comfortable with what has already been submitted and you need the actual report which has to be reviewed by your consultant before you can make a SEQR determination; then I think we have to adjourn. Ms. Raiselis said it sounds like VHB is not going to change the course of events but maybe edit it; so what does that mean for us.

Ms. Connell said in terms of traffic, they did the traffic counts that we requested. In terms of comparison, we would need to see how it compares to what they had in the report. According to what I am hearing tonight, it appears favorable; and even if not, it may only be a few more trips; I can't see it be significant over what has been reported. Ms. Raiselis and Mr. Tedesco said they are comfortable doing a negative declaration.

Ms. Raiselis read the following negative declaration:

RESOLUTION OF THE VILLAGE OF TARRYTOWN ADOPTING A SEQRA NEGATIVE  
DECLARATION FOR THE PROPOSED SITE PLAN APPLICATION OF  
NEW YORK DEALER STATIONS LLC (372 South Broadway (Shell))

1. The Applicant New York Dealer Stations LLC (“Applicant”) seeks site plan approval to modify and expand an existing gasoline filling station and convenience store structure, remove existing service bays and make site, access and parking modifications; and
2. The Planning Board previously circulated a notice of intent to act as lead agency for the SEQRA review and made a determination that the proposed action is an Unlisted Action under SEQRA; and
3. A Short Environmental Assessment Form has been submitted and reviewed along with other information regarding the proposed site plan application; and
4. The Planning Board’s consultant, John Canning, P.E. of VHB Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C. (“VHB”), issued a report to the Planning Board dated September 18, 2015;
5. VHB’s representative visited the site and reviewed the Traffic Access Letter Report prepared by Applicant’s consultant, Stonefield Engineering and Design, dated April 13, 2015.
6. VHB concluded that the data presented indicates that the proposed action should not have a significant impact on area traffic or parking.
7. A representative of VHB appeared before the Planning Board at its September 28, 2015 meeting and responded to questions from the Planning Board members;
8. The Applicant confirmed that the convenience store will have no more than 3 or 4 employees working at any one time and that the convenience store use will be an ancillary use to the fueling component of the station.
9. The Planning Board has conducted public hearings on the matters, and

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that the Planning Board, acting as lead agency, finds that there will be no significant adverse impacts from the proposed site application as what is being proposed will actually be an improvement to an existing traffic condition, the combined 19 spaces provided should adequately accommodate parking activity, what is being proposed avoids any significant adverse impacts on abutting properties and will have no impact on community services, and therefore, the Planning Board issues a SEQRA negative declaration; and it is further

RESOLVED that a copy of this SEQRA Negative Declaration shall be circulated to all Involved Agencies and that as this is an Unlisted Action, in accordance with SEQRA regulations § 617.12(b)(2), a copy of this SEQRA Negative Declaration shall be filed in the lead agency's file.

Dated: September 28, 2015

---

CHAIR

Ms. Raiselis moved, seconded by Mr. Aukland to approve the negative declaration for 372 South Broadway; all in favor. Motion carried.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – Tarrytown Associates LLC – 1-7 Main Street

The Chairman read the following Notice of Public Hearing:

*PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Planning Board of the Village of Tarrytown will hold a public hearing on Monday, September 28, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Building, One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, New York, to hear and consider an application by:*

*Tarrytown Associates, LLC  
60 E. 42<sup>nd</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10165*

*To consider an application for the restoration of previously damaged areas to include two new residential units.*

*The property is located at 1-7 Main Street and is shown on the tax maps as Sheet 1.40, Block 18, Lot 1 and is in the RR zoning district.*

*Documents are available for inspection in the Planning and Zoning Office. All interested parties are invited to attend and be heard. Access to the meeting room is available to*

*the elderly and the handicapped. Signing is available for the hearing-impaired; request must be made to the Village Clerk at least one week in advance of the meeting.*

*By Order of the Planning Board*

*Dale Bellantoni, Secretary to the Planning and Zoning Boards*

*DATED: September 19, 2015*

The certified mailing receipts were submitted and the sign was posted

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Aukland to open the public hearing. Leo Napior of Harfenist Kraut & Perlstein LLP was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Napior said the board is familiar with this project to restore the two rear units which were destroyed in a fire. They were previous before this board and were granted an approval with a payment into the parking fund. While the application was before the Zoning board for various required variances, some violations were issues on the property and then whole application stalled. We have addressed the violations and have come up with an action plan; however, they do not have anything to do with the application. Mr. Napior said they have submitted to the Zoning Board as well. He understands that not enough time has elapsed since the notice for intent to be lead agency was sent out for this board to make a SEQR determination tonight. He is going to proceed to the Zoning Board until this board is ready to act.

Mr. Tedesco asked if the only variance needed is for the increase in the existing non-conforming lot size. Mr. Napior said that is correct assuming the board is going to allow us to pay into the parking fund. Ms. Raiselis asked how many spaces he is asking for in the parking fund. Mr. Napior said five. Ms. Raiselis asked how many space they have for the entire property. Mr. Napior said the original site plan had six; but the Assistant Village Engineering said there was a problem with the turning radius, despite the fact that they were being used without a problem, so the two had to be eliminated which makes four which is why we are before this board.

Mr. Birgy asked if all the issues of bringing it back to the original façade and the number of units has been resolved. Mr. Napior said there was some confusion as to whether there were 16 or 18 units in the past. After some research, it was determined that there were 16; so with this renovation there will be 18. Apparently the original units were bigger. The two additional units require 2 ½ parking spaces each. Mr. Birgy asked if the off-street parking is grandfathered. Mr. McGarvey said its existing non-conforming. Mr. Birgy asked if there were any requirements for sprinklers. Mr. Napior said their prior approval was conditioned on the new units have sprinklers, some of the lines in the stairways being blown out, tested and replaced if necessary.



Mr. Tedesco asked Mr. McGarvey if paying into the parking fund is sufficient or do they still have to go before the Zoning Board for a parking variance. Mr. McGarvey said no parking variance is required, just payment into the parking fund.

Counsel Zalantis said paying into the parking fund for zoning compliance but there is also SEQR. May they can speak to the parking in the area.

Ms. Raiselis said parking is a real problem in Tarrytown. Mr. Tedesco asked Mr. McGarvey if he had any ideas. Mr. McGarvey said the only thing he can think of is a parking study. Ms. Raiselis said maybe we should ask them to do a parking study. Mr. Blau said the Village has never done a parking study; perhaps the applicant would contribute to doing a parking study for the entire Village. Counsel Zalantis said for this particular application we would like something that highlights parking in the area since no parking can be provided on the site.

Mr. Raiselis asked where the present tenants are parking right now. Do a survey and ask each tenant if they have a car and where they are parking and then we will find out if it's reasonable to add to the mess.

Mr. Napier said this building markets itself more to a tenant that does not have a car and who uses the train.

Mr. McGarvey said to find out how many cars they have, do they commute to work on the train and the car just sits waiting to be used and where do they park. Mr. Napier said it will be dependent upon the tenants.

Mr. Tedesco opened the meeting to the public; no one appeared.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Aukland to continue the public hearing; all in favor. Motion carried.

#### NEW PUBLIC HEARING – Tuck – 28 Rosehill Avenue

Javier Taborga, architect, on behalf of the applicant said they are proposing an addition to an existing house which is equal 25% or more of the footprint of the house. They have already gone before the ARB and received an approval. He said the deck is existing, but it will be extended. Mr. Taborga said there are steep slopes on the property but this addition will be put entirely on top of the existing asphalt driveway, so the work will not disturb any steep slopes. There will be no increase in the impervious area and no alteration to the vegetation.

Ms. Raiselis said the board would like to see how they plan to landscape around the addition. Mr. Taborga said the actual footprint is going on top of the driveway and they were planning to put in some ground cover to help control the run-off. Ms. Raiselis said that most of the property is steep slopes. She requested that he provide them with a landscape plan using native plantings that they can submit to our landscape architect so

that we are assured that it is going to do what you want it to do. We would also like to see how you are planning to take care of the ground water.

Mr. Tedesco said we should see a landscape plan that has native plantings. He asked if they are removing any trees. Mr. Taborga said no tree will be removed. Mr. Taborga said he understands their request but they are not building on top of any grass, they are not altering any ground cover. We are putting it right where the driveway is now so no additional runoff will be created. The roof leaders will be attached to the existing system. Ms. Raiselis runoff is part of the landscaping but it is also about how you are going to make this addition look.

Mr. Tedesco said you are not going to disturb any of the vegetation around the driveway. Mr. Taborga said right now there where it slopes there is no vegetation. We were planning to put some ground cover to help with the runoff. Mr. Tedesco said we need to see a landscape plan showing native plantings and we will submit that to our landscape architect for review. That is a requirement of this board.

Mr. Tedesco asked Mr. McGarvey if there are any addition drainage requirements as a result of this addition. Mr. McGarvey said no because he is not increasing the impervious surface.

Mr. Aukland said we should have a streetscape. Ms. Raiselis said you can do a little sketch in portion showing the trees blocking it. She said she understands that this property is very oddly situated on a very steep slope.

Mr. Tedesco asked if any variances are needed. Mr. Taborga said no variances are needed. Mr. Tedesco said it would be good if you could get those items to us before the staff meeting on October 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Aukland to continue the public hearing; all in favor. Motion carried.

#### PRELIMINARY PRESENTATION – Jeris – 15 Baylis Court

Sam Vieira on behalf of the applicant said that the Jeris' were before the Planning Board and Zoning Board in 2011 seeking site plan approval and variances to build a three-family house on 15 Baylis Court, a garage in front of their existing two-family house at 17 Baylis Court and a lot line adjustment between both properties. They received Planning Board Approval for both applications and the lot line adjustment; and they received Zoning Board approval for the variances required for the three-family house at 15 Baylis Court, but not for the garage at 17 Baylis Court. The Zoning Board came to a two/two vote resulting in no decision for 17 Baylis Court. The Zoning Board had an issue with the curb cuts, stating that too much on-street parking would be taken away. Because they did not move forward with the approved project within two years of the approvals, all of their approvals lapsed. They will be going back to the Zoning Board on September 30, 2015 seeking variances for the garage at 17 Baylis Court with

the same application except, as a concession to the board granting the variances, they are reducing their house from a two-family down to a one-family, thus lessening the parking requirements. If they receive Zoning Board approval for the garage, they will be back again for the variances for the three-family house. The Jeris' are seeking approvals simultaneously because parking on Baylis Court is very difficult and they would like to have all of the heavy work for both projects done at the same time. Mr. Vieira said the lot line adjustment was never recorded which is way that approval also lapsed. They now need to get a subdivision.

Ms. Raiselis asked if the only difference in the application is the change from a two-family house to a one family house. Mr. Vieira said correct.

Counsel Zalantis said first they have to get the approved subdivision and the variances for this property. Mr. Vieira said we were told the variances carry with this property. Counsel Zalantis read the following except from the Village Code:

*§305-118 B. (9): Expiration of variance approval. All area or use variances granted by the Board of Appeals shall lapse two years after the date of decision, if a final building permit has not been requested and received by the applicant. In such cases, the applicant may reapply for a variance to the Board of Appeals.*

Counsel Zalantis said the procedure has to go like this; first subdivision approval and the variances required, next the variances for both properties, and then site plan approval. She said no determination can be made tonight because the board doesn't have a subdivision application before it.

Mr. Tedesco said once the applicant gets subdivision approval, they then need to get variances for both properties and site plans approval for both properties; but they can do that simultaneously. Counsel Zalantis said that is correct as long as they already got any variances related to the subdivision; anything related to the subdivision has to be done first. She said the first step in any process is SEQR; that has to happen first. Counsel Zalantis said the code is clear that there is only two ways than you can do a lot line change. In 302-131 it states that you can either go before the Board of Trustees or with final subdivision approval.

Mr. Vieira said on Wednesday, September 30, 2015 they are on the Zoning Board agenda for a structure in the front of their house. Will they be able to be heard? Counsel Zalantis said is it related to the subdivision. Mr. Vieira said the front lot line is the issue not the side lot line. Counsel Zalantis said they cannot approve a variance with a proposed lot line. Mr. McGarvey asked if they have a plan that does shows the lot line down the middle.

Mr. Vieira said the setback is not the issue because there is a 0 setback. The question is whether or not they will be able to build the structure; because if not, they may decide to do nothing. Counsel Zalantis said you can do them both at the same time. You can

file subdivision and site plan together, but the creation of that subdivision implements SEQR and that had to be done first.

Mr. Birgy asked how this affects precedent. Mr. McGarvey said each individual has to stand on its own merit and looked at individually. Mr. Birgy said you are eliminating street parking to provide off-street parking so it kind of a wash.

Ms. Raiselis said taking some cars off the street and putting them in a garage will make that very narrow street more maneuverable.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Ms. Raiselis to adjourn the preliminary presentation; all in favor. Motion carried.

PRELIMINARY PRESENTATION–Raykumar (Apple Med Urgent Care)–131 Central Avenue

Mr. Tedesco stated his understanding of this application. There is an existing 2,000 s.f. one-story vacant bank building to which they are proposing to add approximately 1,700 s.f. for an urgent care facility; the building will remain one story.

Mr. Raiselis asked if this is with the Station Project study area. Mr. McGarvey said not it is not, it is just outside of that area. Mr. Blau said the study area was extended to the intersection, but not the building.

Sid Schlomann, Architect, on behalf of the applicant said that Mr. Tedesco's understanding is correct. He stated that the use is a permitted use and it's presently fully zoning compliant; the addition will be zoning compliant with respect to setbacks, height, lot coverage and impervious coverage. He said the proposed addition will be in the rear of the building where the drive-through teller area exists and slightly larger. They have a storm water plan that will convert approximately 560 s.f. to pervious surface because they will be removing the paved driveway leading to the drive-through teller area. They will be adding grass and plantings. He said there is one tree on the southeast side of the property that may need to be removed in order to put in the foundation for the addition. There will be a parapet roof for the mechanical which will not be seen. Mr. McGarvey asked about the mechanical on the roof now; will they remain. Mr. Schlomann said yes they will remain and the additional mechanicals will be for the addition. He said the interior will be fully renovated and fire sprinklers installed. The entire façade will be stucco.

Ms. Raiselis asked if the architecture is a branding architecture. Mr. Scholmann said the building exists and the intention is not to change it much.

Ms. Raiselis said you need to submit a landscape plan. It would be nice if you could add some bushes and make the building look nicer. Mr. Schlomann said they will put in some plantings and they are putting in a handicap ramp.

Mr. Birgy asked about parking. Mr. Schlomann said we have 16 spaces and 13 are required based on the total square footage. Mr. Aukland asked how many parking spaces are needed for the operation. Mr. Scholmann said on a busy day maybe 14. The board made suggestions to make the parking lot nicer.

Mr. Tedesco said he should have the landscape plan in before the next staff meeting on October 15, 2015.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Aukland to declare this application a Type II action which requires no further SEQR review.

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Aukland to set a public hearing; all in favor. Motion carried.

Mr. McGarvey said the applicant has requested a demo permit for the interior of the building. He asked if the board had any objections. The board members said no objections.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Tedesco moved, seconded by Mr. Aukland, and unanimously carried, that the meeting be adjourned – 8:50 p.m.

Dale Bellantoni  
Secretary