

Zoning Board of Appeals
Village of Tarrytown
Regular Meeting
Village Hall – 1 Depot Plaza
February 12, 2024 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Ms. Kaplan (Acting Chair) Members Kudla, Second Alternate Isaacson;
Counsel Addona; Village Engineer Pennella; Secretary Meszaros

ABSENT: Chairwoman Lawrence, Member Rachlin, Member Young,
First Alternate Jolly.

Ms. Kaplan chaired the meeting in Ms. Lawrence's absence and called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 8, 2024

There was no quorum present to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2024 meeting.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – Nicole Doniger Strom – 68 Leroy Avenue

The following public hearing notice was made available at the public hearing:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Tarrytown will hold a public hearing at **7:30 p.m. on Monday, February 12, 2024** in the Municipal Building, One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, New York to hear and consider an application by:

Nicole Doniger Strom
68 Leroy Avenue
Tarrytown, NY 10591

For variances from Chapter 305 of the Village of Tarrytown ("Zoning Code") for the construction of a two-story addition to a single-family residence.

The property is located at 68 Leroy Avenue and is shown on the Tax Maps of the Village of Tarrytown as Sheet 1.100, Block 71, Lot 9, located in the R-15 and R 7.5 Zoning Districts.

The Applicant seeks the following variances:

§305-19 – Residential R-15 Zone (Attachment 5:1)

1. Column 12 - Minimum Each Side Setback: A variance request of 6.0 ft., where the proposed is 8.0 ft., and the required is 14.0 ft.
2. Column 13 - Minimum Two Side Yard Setbacks: A variance request of 8.42 ft., where the proposed is 21.58 feet, and the required is 30.0 ft.

Documents are available for inspection in the Planning and Zoning Office at Tarrytown Village Hall. 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.

Additional approval will be required by the Planning Board and the Architectural Review Board.

By Order of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Lizabeth Meszaros
Secretary to the Zoning Board

The mailing receipts were received and the signs were posted. Board Members visited the property.

Samuel F. Vieira, RA, the project architect, appeared on behalf of the property owner, Nicole Doniger Strom, also present. He showed the site plan to construct a 24 ft. x 32 ft. two-story addition connected by a breezeway to the existing structure. The addition will consist of a two-car garage on the ground floor and home office studio space on the second floor. Mr. Vieira noted that the north side of this property fronts Leroy Avenue, which is zoned as R 7.5, however, where the existing house sits in the rear of the property and is located in the R 15 zone. In accordance with the village code, the most restrictive zoning criteria should be applied if a lot falls within two zones. Although, the addition is proposed in the R 7.5 zone, the variances were determined and noticed based on the R 15 (the more restrictive) zoning criteria for the entire lot, as determined by the Building Inspector in his Letter of Denial.

Mr. Vieira showed how they have lowered the garage into the hillside in order to diminish the height in comparison to the house and have aligned it in a way so that it does not cover or overlap onto the front of the house. The driveway has been reconfigured to leave enough room for a car to park easily next to the garage and allow the other cars to easily maneuver in and out of the garage. All of the parking on site will be near the garage. As a result, the driveway asphalt area will be less, but they are increasing the impervious coverage by 1,000 s.f. The upper corner of the garage will require a 6 ft. variance and the two side yards will require an 8.42 ft. variance. He noted that if the less stringent R 7.5 zoning criteria were applied, the variance request would be significantly less resulting in a side yard variance of only 2 feet and a two-side yard variance of .42 feet. Counsel Addona commented that a variance would still be needed, either way.

Ms. Kaplan asked about the Pine trees that may be affected. Mr. Vieira advised that he is not sure that these trees will survive during excavation and may have to come down. It would be difficult to ascertain how much of the root structure would be damaged.

Ms. Kaplan asked Mr. Vieira if they are widening the driveway. Mr. Vieira said they are not widening the driveway, they are removing the asphalt where the cars are parking now and moving all of the parking to the new garage area.

Ms. Kaplan asked if anyone in the public would like to comment on this application.

Public comment:

Veronica Kent, who resides at 200 S. Grove Street, has concerns about the overall drainage condition in this area which most people are aware of, and noted that the brook is a separate conversation. She commented that during storms, the sidewalk and gutter areas along Leroy Avenue, heading west toward S. Grove Street, flood over into neighboring yards, and when 44 Leroy Avenue's back yard fills up, water comes up into their basement. This has occurred a number of times. The sidewalk is a contributing factor and the brook is a big factor, but she is concerned that adding another 1,000 s.f. of impervious surface will only exacerbate the existing flooding condition. She likes the plans and would like to see the neighbors get what they want, but she would also like mitigation measures taken to control the flooding downhill. Ms. Kent noted that 44 Leroy Avenue was recently sold and the new residents have not moved in yet.

Counsel Addona advised that the letter she provided to the Zoning Board Members has been made part of the record. She asked Ms. Kent if she wanted the letter read into the record. Ms. Kent said it was not necessary as long as everyone has a copy and it is in the record. Mr. Vieira confirmed that he has seen the letter.

Mr. Vieira addressed Ms. Kent's concerns and commented that the village's stormwater retention net-zero law that whenever additional impervious surface is added, the property owner must direct, contain and filter the additional stormwater underground. The proposed structure and breezeway will have gutters and liters connected to an underground retention system which will collect water into a chamber most likely located underground in the front lawn. He is not the engineer on record so cannot confirm the location since the system has not been designed yet, but it will contain any additional water from the new addition and the driveway as required by code. During a normal rainfall, this water is contained on the property. He advised that every project in the village, regardless of whether a variance or site plan approval is needed, the local law requires the property owner to maintain stormwater on site and that stormwater plans are usually reviewed by the Planning Board and not this Board.

Counsel Addona advised Mr. Vieira that the one of the criteria that the Zoning Board considers for an area variance in their balancing test is whether or not there will be any adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. While she understands that Mr. Vieira is saying that this stormwater review will be undertaken with the Planning Board, this Board needs to be satisfied with the drainage in their balancing test and may want to see it addressed sooner rather than later.

Mr. Vieira commented that they would not get a building permit if stormwater was not satisfactorily addressed and asked if he needs to submit a stormwater plan to this Board. Mr. Isaacson asked if the plan has been submitted to the Planning Board yet.

Mr. Pennella said there has not been a stormwater plan submitted to the Planning Board. There have been drainage improvements in this area to help out the neighbors and there are drainage concerns. With regard to stormwater, a net-zero increase means that not a drop of water can leave a property over what is being added, not what is existing. Typical designs are for a 25-year or 100-year storms. A 100-year storm is a storm that occurs 1% of the time every year and these storms seem to be more frequent. He believes the question for this Board is whether or not they will be satisfied with a 100-year storm design or if they want the design to go above that.

Mr. Vieira advised that they submitted an application to the Planning Board first, but the secretary advised, after the work session, that the Planning Board wanted them to go for the variances first and return to the Planning Board for site plan review, if the variances were approved. Mr. Vieira said that they did not develop a stormwater plan yet since this is not normally done until after the variances are approved, in order to protect his client from extra design costs, should the variances be denied. If the variances were approved, a stormwater plan would be designed for review by the Planning Board, who traditionally deals with stormwater review, based on code criteria, which is another layer of the approval process.

Counsel Addona advised the Board that, in this case, they would be making a presumption based upon what Planning Board decides will be sufficient, which is a hard position to be in. Counsel Addona commented that a member of the public has brought up the drainage condition which is an environmental concern and something that the Board could consider as part of the criteria for an area variance. Another factor to consider is if the design could be altered to eliminate the need for a variance, and then the applicant would not be before this Board.

With regard to voting on applications this evening, Counsel Addona advised the applicant and the public that there are only three Zoning Board Members present this evening; therefore, the applicant would have to get a favorable vote from all three Board Members in order for the variances to be approved.

Ms. Kaplan commented that she would like to continue this public hearing to next month when there are more members present to consider this application.

Mr. Vieira said this is a first. He is trying to protect his client from doing a full stormwater study which will be done to village standards and reviewed by the Planning Board. He understands that Ms. Kaplan feels uncomfortable. It is his understanding that the Board is asking them to wait another month, and hopefully there will be a quorum. He is concerned that if the study is not done by the next meeting, then this Board will potentially not be in a position to move forward with this application.

Ms. Kaplan said it is an important study. Counsel Addona said that the flooding condition was specifically brought up by the member of the public to the Zoning Board and it needs to be addressed by the Board.

Mr. Vieira said, either way, stormwater mitigation would have to be addressed even if there was no need to come before this Board for a variance.

Mr. Isaacson asked Mr. Vieira if his concern was is that even if he does the study, the Board may still not grant the variances. Mr. Vieira said that is part of it. Mr. Isaacson commented that it is a timing issue and that is a risk the applicant will have to take. If the stormwater study addresses the concerns, then there is nothing to worry about.

Mr. Vieira asked who will be reviewing the plans, since the Board Members are not engineers. Mr. Pennella advised that he would review the study, but he noted that there may be additional concerns other than the stormwater with regard to this project.

Ms. Kaplan commented that it is not a small change to the neighborhood.

Counsel Addona advised that the Board wants to see the study because it is part of the criteria in this situation.

Mr. Pennella said the system could be designed for a 100-year storm or above if it is necessary. Counsel Addona suggested altering the design so that a variance is not needed. Mr. Vieira respectfully asked Mr. Pennella what the system should be designed to and how do we get to a design that the Board will be satisfied with so that he can consult with the engineer. Mr. Pennella said you can either retain it on site or infiltrate it on site. He can review the analysis and provide an explanation to the Board. Mr. Pennella asked the Board if there are any other issues besides the stormwater that would impact the Board's decision.

Ms. Kaplan said the size of the addition is large. Ms. Kudla asked if the neighbor to the side of the garage had any comment.

Nicole Doniger Strom, the owner, advised the Board and said she has not heard anything negative from her neighbors. She believes they are excited since it raises their property values. When they moved in, they installed some curtain drains. She does not want to cause any flooding problems for the neighborhood. The neighbor next door would like the trees to come down since they are worried that they could fall onto their home. The addition will be low enough so that there will be no light shedding into the neighboring yard. Ms. Kudla confirmed that the back side of the garage has windows on the upper floor.

Mr. Pennella asked if there were any issues with moving the structure over a bit, about 2 feet. Mr. Vieira said 2 feet would still require a variance. They were hoping to be able to back in an out of the garage for maneuverability and they didn't want structure to overlap onto the existing structure.

Mr. Pennella said if you moved it 2 feet and asked the Board to use the R 7.5 criteria, maybe that could work. Counsel Addona advised that they would still need an interpretation. Mr. Vieira said he has no issue with providing the stormwater study. He has never dealt with a stormwater issue with the Zoning Board. They will be designing for 100-year storm and they could reduce it by 2 feet. He did not want his client to spend money on a stormwater plan and then have the variances denied. Ms. Strom came up and said if you keep the design the way it is, it will be less visible from the street, since it is tucked in. Mr. Pennella noted that a minimum 100-year storm analysis would probably end up higher once it is designed. Mr. Vieira would like his engineer to have a conversation with Mr. Pennella to consult about this matter.

Counsel Addona read the criteria again and advised Mr. Vieira that saying that the Zoning Board are not engineers and cannot review this plan is not helping this case. The Board wants to see what the applicant can possibly do to improve the situation. It is a criteria that the Board has to consider when granting this variance.

Ms. Kudla moved, seconded by Mr. Isaacson, to adjourn the public hearing to March 11, 2024.

The secretary recorded the vote:
Member Kaplan: Yes
Member Kudla: Yes
2nd Alt Member Isaacson Yes

All in favor. Motion carried. 3 – 0

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING

Gotham Design Planning and Development - 25 South Washington Street

Variances to demolish the existing two-story single-family home and 1 ½ story detached garage in order to construct a new three-story primary structure with 3 dwelling units and parking.

The plans have been revised and this application was re-noticed for this meeting. The following notice was available at the public hearing:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Tarrytown will hold a public hearing at **7:30 p.m. on Monday, February 12, 2024** in the Municipal Building, One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, New York to hear and consider an application by **Gotham Design Planning and Development - 329 Broadway, Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522**, for variances from Chapter 305 of the Village of Tarrytown (“Zoning Code”) for the proposed demolition of the existing two-story single-family home and 1 ½ story detached garage in order to construct a new three-story primary structure with 3 dwelling units and parking in the rear. The property is **located at 25 South Washington Street and is shown on the Tax Maps of the Village of Tarrytown as Sheet 1.70, Block 33, Lot 9, located in the M 1.5 zone.**

The following variances are sought:

§305-32 – M 1.5 Multifamily Zone (Attachment 6:1):

1. Column 6 - Minimum Lot Size: A variance of 6,633 s.f. , where the proposed is 4,867 s.f., and the required lot size is 11,500 s.f. (for 3 units).
2. Column 7 - Width at Front of Building: A variance of 9.02 feet, where 30.98 feet is existing/proposed, and 40 feet is required.
3. Column 8 - Principal Building Coverage: A variance of 72 s.f. (1.5%), where 1,532 s.f. (31.5%) is proposed, and 1,460 s.f. (30%) is permitted.
4. Column 11 – Minimum Front Yard Setback: A variance of 17 feet, where 3 feet is proposed, and 20 feet is required.
5. Column 12 – Minimum Side Yard Setback (South): A variance of 12 feet, where 3 feet is proposed, and 15 feet is required.
6. Column 12 - Minimum Side Yard Setback (North): A variance of 7.5 feet, where 7.5 feet is proposed, and 15 feet is required.
7. Column 13 – Minimum Two Side Yards: A variance of 19.5 feet, where 10.5 feet is proposed, and 30 feet is required.
8. Column 18 – Maximum Height (Stories): A variance for 1 story, where 3 stories are proposed, and 2 stories are permitted.

§305-63 C. (3) – Off Street Parking and Loading (Attachment 6:2)

9. Column 12 – Parking in Side Yard Setback (South) - A variance of 12 feet, where 3 feet is existing, and 15 feet is required.
10. Column 12 – Parking in Side Yard Setback (North) - A variance of 13 feet, where 2 feet is existing, and 15 feet is required.
11. Column 15 – Parking in Rear Yard Setback - A variance of 29 feet, where 16 feet is existing, and 45 feet is required.

§305-63 C. (5)(c) [3] – Landscape Strip:

12. A variance of 2 feet, where 3 feet is existing, and 5 feet is required.

§305-63 D. (1) Off Street Parking:

13. A variance of 3 parking spaces, where 5 spaces are proposed, and 8 spaces are required (2.5/d.u.)

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. Additional approval is required from the Planning Board, the Board of Trustees and the Architectural Review Board.

By Order of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Lizabeth Meszaros, Secretary to the Zoning Board

Dated: February 2, 2024

The mailing receipts were received and the signs were posted. Board Members have previously visited the property.

Paddy Steinschneider, the project design coordinator, with Gotham Design Planning and Development, appeared on behalf of the property owner and presented the site

plan. They have narrowed the building at the base to widen the driveway from 8 feet to 10 feet. They will still need a variance from the NYS for the driveway, and for the height. There will be five parking spaces in the rear; two rows of parking will be provided on site. He showed the existing vs. proposed driveway and noted that nothing has changed with the neighbor; the same situation will exist but the driveway will be widened for easier access. He again noted that there is not a huge parking problem in this area of the village. He would like to adjourn to next month when there is a full Board to consider the variances.

Counsel Addona commented that since the applicant would like to adjourn to next month, if the Board has any concerns, perhaps the Board can bring them up tonight. This will give the applicant time to address them at the next meeting.

Ms. Kudla asked again if there was any contact with the neighbor. Mr. Pennella noted that the neighbor has the access driveway, not the applicant. The 10 feet helps for access to the rear for the parking. In addition, the applicant will be modifying the curb cut which will require BOT approval. Mr. Steinschneider advised that he does not believe they will lose any street parking.

There was no one in the public who wished to comment.

Ms. Kudla moved, seconded by Mr. Isaacson, to continue the public hearing at the March 11, 2024 meeting.

The secretary recorded the vote:
Member Kaplan: Yes
Member Kudla: Yes
2nd Alt Member Isaacson Yes
All in favor. Motion carried: 3 - 0

NEW PUBLIC HEARING – Niall Cain, RA – 35 Sunset Way

The following public hearing notice was made available at the public hearing:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Tarrytown will hold a public hearing at **7:30 p.m. on Monday, February 12, 2024** in the Municipal Building, One Depot Plaza, Tarrytown, New York to hear and consider an application by:

Niall Cain, Architect
5 Atilda Avenue
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522

For a variance from Chapter 305 of the Village of Tarrytown (“Zoning Code”) for an extension to the front entrance overhang.

The property is located at 35 Sunset Way and is shown on the Tax Maps of the Village of Tarrytown as Sheet 1.50, Block 22, Lot 16 and is located in the R-10 zone.

The Applicant seeks the following variance from §305-20 – Attachment 5:1, Column 11, of the Zoning Code as follows:

1. A minimum front yard variance of 4.08 feet, where the existing is 17.68 ft (based on a 7.32 ft. prior variance granted on June 6, 2022), and the required is 25 feet.

Documents are available for inspection in the Planning and Zoning Office at Tarrytown Village Hall. 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.

Additional approval will be required by the Architectural Review Board.
By Order of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Lizabeth Meszaros
Secretary to the Zoning Board

The mailing receipts were received and the signs were posted. Board Members visited the property.

Niall Cain, the project architect, appeared on behalf of the property owner and presented the site plan. He advised that they were before this Board in 2022 for variances for the addition to the home. The property is located at the end of the cul-de-sac in a unique location. His client would like to make the front of the home more appealing by pulling out the front porch 30 inches and adding 2 columns with an overhang, which will require an additional variance. He showed what the Board previously approved in 2022, and the proposed new columns with the overhang. He noted that the house across the street has a similar style which inspired his client to make the change. In addition, there is a 22.56-foot right-of-way and the house is set quite far back from the curb.

Bobbie Asher, the owner, appeared before the Board and advised that he spoke with the neighbors who had no objection to the change. He confirmed that the public hearing notices were mailed and he received one response from a neighbor, Maria, who lives across the street, who said, "Oh ok. Love that extra cover at the front door".

There was no one in the public who wished to comment.

The applicant was comfortable with having only three Board Members vote on the variances this evening.

Ms. Kudla moved, seconded by Mr. Isaacson, to close the public hearing.

The secretary recorded the vote:
Member Kaplan: Yes

Member Kudla: Yes
2nd Alt Member Isaacson Yes
All in favor. Motion carried. 3- 0

Ms. Kaplan read through and responded to the criteria for an area variance as follows:

1. That no undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood nor will a detriment to nearby properties be created by the granting of the area variance. *Ms. Kaplan stated that the proposed project will not bring an undesirable change to the neighborhood; it will enhance the character of the neighborhood.*
2. That the benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance. *Ms. Kaplan stated that the benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some other method other than the area variance.*
3. That the requested area variance is not substantial. *Ms. Kaplan stated that the requested variances is not substantial.*
4. That the proposed variances will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. *Ms. Kaplan stated that the proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood.*
5. That the alleged difficulty was self-created which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the variance. *Ms. Kaplan stated that the alleged difficulty is self-created but that does not preclude the Board from granting this variance.*

Ms. Kudla moved, seconded by Isaacson, to grant the area variance and authorize Counsel Addona to prepare a Resolution memorializing the discussion during the public hearing to also include general conditions of approval.

The secretary recorded the vote:
Member Kaplan: Yes
Member Kudla: Yes
2nd Alt Member Isaacson Yes
All in favor. Motion carried. 3 - 0

PRELIMINARY PRESENTATION - Gabrielle Salman, RA - 81 N Washington Street

Site plan approval for the change of use and legalization of a non-conforming four-family multi-family dwelling, documented as a two-family dwelling.

Gabrielle Salman, RA, the project architect, appeared before the Board. The owner of the property, Mr. Torres, was also present. Counsel Addona advised that this is a preliminary presentation and the Board will not be taking any action on this matter.

This application is currently being reviewed under SEQRA with the Planning Board, as Lead Agency, for the environmental review. Counsel Addona advised that the purpose of the discussion this evening is to have the applicant present the project and give the Zoning Board, as an involved agency, the opportunity to ask questions, and to comment on any issues that may be of concern to them. These comments will be conveyed to the Planning Board as considered as part of the review process. Counsel Addona also advised that the applicant will be seeking relief for area variances only. The applicant is not seeking a “Use” variance since multi-family dwellings are allowed in the M 1.5 zoning district, where this property is located. She added that the bulk requirements listed in the M 1.5 Zoning Schedule are based on the number of units.

Gabrielle Salman, RA, the project architect, presented the plan and explained that the four-story building is 100 years old, with two legal units in the building. They are before this Board to seek variances to legalize the other two units. The property is well maintained and has a beautiful yard. They would like to keep the backyard and keep the parking “As is”, as suggested by the Planning Board.

Mr. Pennella advised that the applicant was asked by the Planning Board to submit an “As is” parking plan after reviewing a number of iterations and comments from the Village Landscape Architect Consultant. The original plan provided for 5 parking spaces in the rear, but the Planning Board members were concerned about losing the entire back yard and the removal of trees in order to add the additional parking. They felt that the additional parking on site would be detrimental to the surrounding neighboring properties and, if possible, should be left “As is” since it appears that the existing 3 parking spaces work. This plan will minimize the amount of disturbance in the rear and neighboring properties. The Planning Board also suggested that this plan be presented to the Zoning Board to see if they would have any objection to the plan with regard to the variance requests, particularly for the parking since it would increase the variance request.

Ms. Salman showed the plan and briefly went through the five variances requests. With regard to the parking variance, if the Zoning Board was amenable to the parking plan presented this evening, they would require relief of 7 parking spaces.

Code Section: §305-32 M-1.5 Multifamily Attachment 6:2	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance Required
305-63 C. (3)(a) Setback - Driveway	5 ft.	-	2.5 ft.	2.5 ft.
§305-63 C. (3) Parking in a front yard setback Attachment 6:2 Column 11	25 ft.	-	17.5 ft.	7.5 ft.
§305-63 C. (3) Parking in a side yard setback Attachment 6:2 Column 12 - South	20 ft.	-	0 ft.	20 ft.
§305-63 C.(5)(c)[3] Landscape Strips	5 ft.	-	0 ft.	5.0 ft.
305-63 D. (1) Off Street Parking 2.5 /d.u.	10 spaces	0 spaces	3 spaces	7 spaces

Ms. Kaplan commented that the property does has a very long driveway.

Mr. Pennella noted that this plan will keep the grassy area in the rear with no proposed parking spaces. The three cars will park in the driveway. The Village Landscape Consultant commented that the landscape strip that was originally proposed in the rear would have impacted the neighbor’s basement wall which could have caused water

infiltration. She felt that it may be better to seek a greater variance to avoid any disturbance to the neighboring properties and suggested planting a tree (s) to make up for it. Ms. Salman advised that they are proposing to plant two new trees in the rear yard.

Counsel Addona asked the Board if they had any comments or if they see anything problematic that they would like her to report to the Planning Board.

There were only three members present this evening. None of the members expressed any concerns with the plan as presented, particularly with regard to the parking plan.

Counsel Addona advised that the applicant will need a Negative Declaration SEQRA determination from the Planning Board before they can return to seek the necessary variances. At that time, the applicant can move forward to seek the required variances.

Ms. Salman thanked the Board for their time.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Isaacson moved, seconded by Ms. Kaplan, to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 p.m. All in favor. Motion carried. 3-0

Liz Meszaros- Secretary