

*These are intended to be “Action Minutes”, which primarily record the actions voted on by the Planning Board on February 22, 2012. The full public record of this Meeting is the audio/video recording made of this meeting and kept in the Planning Board’s records.*

**PRESENT:** Michael Ianniello, Chairman; Lou Mendes,  
Ingemar Sjunneemark, Stewart Sterk, Lee Wexler  
Hugh Greechan, Engineering Consultant  
Lester Steinman, Esq., Legal Consultant  
Susan Favate, BFJ Planning

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Ianniello called to order the Regular Meeting at 7:03 p.m.

#### **1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

On Motion of Mr. Sjunneemark, seconded by Mr. Sterk, the February 8, 2012 Minutes are approved.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

On Motion of Mr. Sterk, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark, the February 15, 2012 Minutes are approved.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

#### **2. 122-134 MAMARONECK AVE. Michael Berta – Site plan approval**

Mr. Berta appeared for the applicant and stated that the parking variance is approved, and all outstanding matters have been resolved including storm water management. He said the gate hours will be from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., and noted that 11:00 p.m. is to accommodate the Emelin Theatre patrons.

Mr. Berta suggested that there be ten (10) years guarantee for the public access area in the Resolution. Mr. Sjunneemark said it is reasonable, and in ten years it will be necessary to return to the Planning Board. Mr. Sjunneemark then said that the Board will be flexible should unanticipated issues arise. Mr. Berta said that there will be security cameras monitoring the area.

Mr. Dave Saccardi, owner, stated that ten years duration meets their obligations. Ms. Oakley reported earlier that the landscaping plan was finalized. Ms. Favate inquired about parking lot signs. Mr. Berta said that a stanchion will be put up by the steps. Mr. Wexler inquired about the sign for Mamaroneck Avenue. Mr. Berta said the Mamaroneck Avenue sign is inside the courtyard on the pillar. He said the signs are indicated on the drawing.

On motion of Mr. Sterk, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark, the proposed actions have been determined to be consistent with the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP).

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

On motion of Mr. Sterk, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark, the Application for the Site Plan is approved with the condition that the public access area be reviewed in ten (10) years on February 11, 2022, the expiration date; and subject to the approval of the Resolution to be reviewed at the next Planning Board meeting on March 14, 2012.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

Mr. Saccardi came forward and thanked the Planning Board, consultants, and all who were involved in this matter. He commented that everyone acted professionally and responsive. In summary, he stated that the project is far superior to what he started out with, and is grateful for all the recommendations.

### **WETLAND PERMIT PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

#### **3. 516 SHORE ACRES DRIVE –Richard & Meredith Canter – Reconfiguration of existing recreational docking facility and shoreline stabilization. Continuation of the Public Hearing on January 25, 2012.**

Mr. Dan Natchez of Daniel S. Natchez & Associates appeared for the applicant. He said that they were waiting for a coastal consistency determination by the HZCM. Also, he said the wetland permit requirements need to be addressed. He stated that the Application is consistent with LWRP, and a structure permit was granted.

The docking facility has been in existence since 1974. Mr. Natchez then said the dock will be pulled back less than one foot. He commented that many different approaches have been considered to get to this point. Mr. Greechan said that he had discussions with Mr. Natchez and the structural space and the piles are set, and the methodology is good.

Mr. Wexler inquired if the elevation of the pier will look different than it does today. Mr. Natchez said it will be raised twelve inches. Mr. Wexler then inquired if lighting is being proposed. Mr. Natchez said no.

Mr. Ianniello asked if there are any comments from the public.

Mr. Joseph Russo, Village harbor master, came forward. He said that the proposed work extends too far out to the channel, and will encroach on the fairway. He stated that the project can be done with fewer pilings. Also, environmental treated wood could be used. He said the gangway also should be painted to match what is currently there. He stated that standards need to be set. Mr. Sterk commented that since there are no standards, ones views and beliefs cannot be used as the standard. Mr. Russo recommended that the Board go to the site, and also go to Port Drive and look at the recent work there. The Board agreed to meet on Sunday, February 26, at 10 a.m. for a site visit. Mr. Natchez stated that he plans to attend.

Mr. Mendes suggested that Mr. Natchez and Mr. Russo meet again before the next meeting to come to a reasonable agreement, otherwise their differences will be brought to the next meeting and nothing will have changed.

Mr. Russo said that this dock should go back three feet. He said that a 50 foot permanent gangway is too large. Mr. Natchez said that it is not feasible based upon the engineering data that was presented. Mr. Natchez said that a survey was done, and there are engineered plans by licensed professionals. Mr. Russo said the dock location should be changed. Mr. Natchez said that the water depths are what they are.

Mr. Russo said his concerns are for the construction of a dock that warrants a structure permit. Mr. Natchez said it was already granted. He continued and said that the Applicant has met all thresholds required for a wetland permit. He said that the required information was submitted in detail.

Mr. Mendes said that going to the site is a good plan but it will not affect the wetland permit. Mr. Natchez said that issues before the Planning Board are different from the issues for a structures permit. Mr. Russo said that *this* Application should be a starting point for change. He continued and said that there are alternatives to get to the water other than a 50 foot gangway.

Mr. Sterk commented that right now there is nothing in the Code pertaining to the size of a boat that one can have and the Planning Board cannot fix this. The Village must adopt standards that the Planning Board can apply. Mr. Sterk then said there needs to be guidelines for an Applicant to follow as well. Mr. Sterk reminded that the Planning Board is not a legislative body of the Village, but interprets what is in the Code.

Mr. Ianniello said there are two ways to proceed either with a type of pier or a floating dock. Mr. Natchez said that a floating dock cannot be done safely, and the float location cannot change.

Mr. Sterk moved to declare this a Type II action under State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

#### **4. 1084 BAYHEAD DRIVE –Mr. & Mrs. Hut –Wetland Permit**

Mr. Paul Noto appeared for the applicant and said that they focused on attaining a one to one on the impervious surface. They also have resubmitted the storm water management plan. Mr. Greechan said that he reviewed the plan and it meets all requirements of the storm water regulations.

Mr. Noto said this is a one-story addition within the buffer and 2,142 square feet of impervious surface is being removed within the 100 foot buffer. And 1,412 square feet of impervious surface is being removed outside of the buffer.

Mr. Ianniello asked if there are any comments.

Mrs. Dorothy Fay, neighbor, came forward. She noted that the house facing ‘walking out to the sea’ is actually a northerly direction. Most of the addition faces north. She queried as to why the drawing is not configured the way the house is situated. She then asked what the height is for the new addition, and if the roof is pitched or flat. Also, she asked if the trees noted on the plan are existing trees or proposed, and said if they exist, they are taller than 18 feet. Mr. Rex Gedney interjected and said that 18 feet represents the width of the tree, not height.

Mr. Gedney said that the house is all one-level living. No new trees will be added and no trees will be removed. Mrs. Fay noted that there are plantings all around the addition. Mr. Gedney said they will be low foundation plants. He said the roof will be pitched. There will be two different roofing materials, one will be the existing slate roof, and the new roof will be a different component. She remarked that she hopes the project goes forward.

Mr. Sterk moved to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

Mr. Sterk moved to declare this a Type II action under State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

On motion of Mr. Sterk, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark, the proposed actions have been determined to be consistent with the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP).

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

On motion of Mr. Sterk, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark, the Application for a wetland permit is approved, and subject to the approval of the Resolution to be reviewed at the March 14, 2012 Planning Board meeting.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

##### **5. 1020 COVE ROAD –Jennifer Kronick & Jason Shapiro – Wetland Permit**

Ms. Jennifer Kronick and Mr. Jason Shapiro appeared with their architect, James Fleming. Ms. Kronick said that they were issued a permit by the building department and began the work. The plan is for a small covered front porch, second level front dormer, and a back deck. The inspection passed and they got an okay to move forward with the front porch. The excavation also passed for the rear footings. One third of the concrete was poured in the rear of the property.

They were notified to stop work as a wetland permit is required. Ms. Kronick said there is no evidence on the Village map that their house is a wetland property. She said that they are anxious to move forward. She commented that there are no gutters on the house, and part of the back of the house is wrapped. Ms. Kronick stated that the plans have since been revised.

Mr. Greechan said that there are storm water issues that need to be worked out concerning the three CULTEC drainage systems as they must comply with the water quality standards for the Village. He then said that the entire house is in the flood plain and is elevation 12. Mr. Greechan stated that some shifting needs to be done and is not major. He said that he will meet with the applicants and their architect to finalize the drainage plan.

Ms. Kronick continued and said that the house was built in 1951. They are putting up a dormer on the second level in front. The shed will be moved. Gravel will be put down in the back. The driveway will remain as is. She continued and said that they plan to use rain barrels to collect water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. Ianniello asked if there are any comments from the audience: There were none.

Mr. Sjunneemark moved to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Sterk.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

Mr. Sterk moved to declare this a Type II action under State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

On motion of Mr. Sjunneemark, seconded by Mr. Sterk, the proposed actions have been determined to be consistent with the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP).

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

On motion of Mr. Sterk, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark, the Application for a Wetland Permit is approved with the condition that the CULTEC drainage system be finalized including calculations, and reviewed by Mr. Greechan, and subject to the approval of the Resolution to be reviewed at the March 14, 2012 Planning Board meeting.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

## **APPROVAL RESOLUTIONS**

### **6. 534 WAVERLY AVE. –Change-of-use**

#### **RESOLUTION VILLAGE OF MAMARONECK PLANNING BOARD**

Adopted February 22, 2012

**RE: 524 Waverly Avenue – Resolution of Site Plan Approval**

After due discussion and deliberation, on motion by Mr. Sterk, seconded by Mr. Sjunneberg and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, on January 20, 2012, 306 Fayette Avenue Realty, the “Applicant,” (all references to which shall include and be binding upon the Applicant’s successors and/or assigns) submitted to the Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board (“Planning Board”) an Application with accompanying documentation, seeking site plan approval for a proposed change of use (“Application”) from the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is located at 524 Waverly Avenue, within the M-1 Manufacturing District; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant proposed a change of use for the existing building on the site, from a vacant warehouse to an auto parts wholesaler and to indicate reserved spaces within the existing parking facility for such use, and this proposal (“Project”) is described and illustrated on the following set of plans as submitted and subsequently revised by the Applicant which form a part of the Application:

1. Sheet C-101 “Site Plan,” prepared by Site Design Consultants, as revised through January 25, 2012;
2. Coastal Assessment Form (“CAF”) dated January 20, 2012 and submitted pursuant to Local Law No. 30-1984;
3. Short-Form Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”) dated January 20, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the subject property was previously the subject of a site plan approval dated May 13, 2010, and a subsequent modification to that site plan dated April 13, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board is familiar with the Property and all aspects of the proposed action and has been satisfied that the proposed development will conform to the requirements of the Village Code; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has carefully examined the Application and received comments and recommendations from the Village Engineering Consultant as summarized in a memo dated February 3, 2012; from the Village’s Planning Consultant as summarized in a memo dated February 6, 2012; and from the Planning Board’s Attorney;

WHEREAS, a duly advertised public meeting was held on the application for a site plan approval on February 8, 2012, at which time all those wishing to be heard were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board determined on February 8, 2012, that the Project is a Type II Action pursuant to 6 NYCRR. § 617.5(c) (1); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board determined on February 8, 2012, that both the Project is consistent with the Village's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program ("LWRP") pursuant to Chapter 240 of the Village Code.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. The Planning Board hereby grants all requested approvals to the Project subject to the following conditions:
  - (a) The Applicant shall designate the 12 parking spaces reserved for the proposed wholesaling use with placement of signage at each parking space, as approved by the Building Inspector.
  - (b) The Applicant shall pay all outstanding consultant review fees in connection with Planning Board review of this application.
2. When the above conditions have been satisfied, three (3) sets of the above-referenced plans illustrating the approved conditions shall be submitted for the endorsement of the Planning Board Chairman. One (1) set of the endorsed plans will be returned to the Applicant, one (1) set will be provided to the Village Building Inspector and one (1) set will be provided to the Planning Board secretary. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Building Department will verify that the "as-built" conditions conform to the final approved site plan.

VOTE: Ayes: Ianniello, Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

PLANNING BOARD  
Village of Mamaroneck

Date: February 22, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Ianniello, Chairman

**7. 615 FIRST STREET –David Witt – Flood Variance**

**RESOLUTION**  
**VILLAGE OF MAMARONECK PLANNING BOARD**  
Adopted February 22, 2012

**RE: David Witt 615 First Street – Resolution of Flood Variance Approval**



After due discussion and deliberation, on motion by Mr. Sterk, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, on January 27, 2012, David Witt, the “Applicant,” (all references to which shall include and be binding upon the Applicant’s successors and/or assigns) submitted to the Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board (“Planning Board”) an Application with accompanying documentation, seeking flood variance approval (“Application”) from the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is located at 615 First Street, within the R-2F Residential District, and within a Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant proposed to renovate and repair the first floor of the existing dwelling, to remediate damage experienced during an August 28, 2011, flooding event, and these and other associated improvements are illustrated on the following set of plans as submitted and subsequently revised by the Applicant which form a part of the Application:

1. Drawing Number 1 of 1 “First Floor ‘Flood’ Renovation,” prepared by Frank Herbert, general contractor dated November 25, 2011;
2. “Structural Damage Report – Flood, The Witt Residence,” prepared by HAS Engineers & Scientists dated December 14, 2011;
3. Drawing Number 1 “615 First Street, Mamaroneck, NY,” prepared by Clark Neuringer Architect dated February 14, 2012;
4. Letter from Richard A. Spinelli, Land Surveyor, dated January 4, 2012, verifying the first floor elevation of the existing structure;
5. Coastal Assessment Form (“CAF”) dated January 27, 2012, as revised through February 9, 2012;
6. Property survey prepared by Ralph Cronquist dated December 6, 1947;

WHEREAS, in support of its Application, the Applicant also submitted a Long-Term Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”) pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act [“SEQRA”(6 NYCRR Part 617)] dated January 27, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has carefully examined the Application and received comments and recommendations from the Village’s Planning Consultant in a memo dated February 8, 2012, regarding the criteria for a flood variance, SEQRA and consistency with the Village LWRP; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board received comments and recommendations from the Village’s Engineering Consultant in a memo dated February 3, 2012, regarding the criteria for a flood variance and the standards for a floodplain development permit; and

WHEREAS, the application was heard at the Planning Board's regular meeting on February 8, 2012, and at a special meeting on February 15, 2012, at which times all those wishing to be heard were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, on February 8, 2012, the Planning Board directed the applicant to confirm with the Building Inspector the specific variances from the standards in Section 186-5 that would be required for the proposed project to proceed, and to provide written documentation supporting granting of a variance based on the criteria in Section 186-6, and these directives were confirmed in a memo dated February 9, 2012, from the Village's Planning Consultant to the Applicant's architect; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant submitted the requested information in a memorandum dated February 14, 2012, and a supplemental memo dated February 15, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Building Inspector confirmed in a letter dated February 14, 2012, that the proposed project would require variances from the standards provided in Section 186-5B; and

WHEREAS, in granting a flood variance under the Village's Flood Damage Prevention law, the Planning Board has determined that the standards and criteria set forth in Section 186-6 have been satisfied; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board determined on February 8, 2012, that the Project is a Type II Action pursuant to 6 NYCRR. § 617.5(c) (2) and (9); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board determined on February 15, 2012, that the Project is consistent with the Village's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program ("LWRP") pursuant to §240 of the Village Code.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. The Planning Board hereby grants all requested approvals to the Project subject to the following conditions:
  - (a) Any expenditures made to date to remediate damage from flooding events will count toward the future determination of substantial improvements, as defined in Section 186-2.
  - (b) The Applicant shall provide additional structural details requested and required by the Village's consulting engineer.
  - (c) The Applicant shall make a declaration on the property recording this resolution, for the edification of future property owners.
  - (d) The Applicant shall pay all outstanding consultant review fees in connection with Planning Board review of this application.
  - (e) The Applicant shall forward a copy of the CAF to the Harbor and Coastal Zone Management Commission (HCZMC), pursuant to the provisions of Section 240-28 (B) of the Village Code.

2. When the above conditions have been satisfied, three (3) sets of the above-referenced plans illustrating the approved conditions shall be submitted for the endorsement of the Planning Board Chairman. One (1) set of the endorsed plans will be returned to the Applicant, and one (1) set will be provided to the Village Building Inspector and one (1) set will be provided to the Planning Board secretary. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Building Department will verify that the “as-built” conditions conform to the final approved wetland permit.

VOTE: Ayes: Ianniello, Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

PLANNING BOARD  
Village of Mamaroneck

Date: February 22, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Ianniello, Chairman

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**8. 156 MAMARONECK AVE. – Ann Mary Caro Kuriakosi-Change of use; restaurant to beauty salon.**

Mr. Rossini appeared for the applicant and stated that the business at this location was a restaurant and will be converted to a beauty salon. He said the exterior will remain the same. There will be plumbing upgrades and some cosmetic changes on the interior. Mr. Ianniello inquired about outside lighting. The architect said there is no change. Ms. Favate stated that there are no site plan issues.

Mr. Sterk moved to declare this a Type II action under State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

On motion of Mr. Sjunneemark, seconded by Mr. Sterk, the proposed actions have been determined to be consistent with the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP).

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello  
Nays: None

On motion of Mr. Wexler, seconded by Mr. Sterk, the Application for a Change of Use is approved, and subject to the approval of the Resolution to be reviewed at the March 14, 2012 Planning Board meeting.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

## **9. FRENCH AMERICAN SCHOOL- Referral from Board of Trustees**

Michael Zarin, Esq, of Zarin & Steinmetz, appeared for the applicant. The applicant is requesting a zoning change in an M-1 zoning district for a private school for grades 11 and 12. He said the administrative offices are located on Fenimore Road. The installation of modular room dividers will create classrooms and a teachers' lounge. There will be no extension or build out, no additional impervious surface, no parking issues, and no change to the building exterior. He said that there is a pending Application with the City of White Plains to build a school to house all grades at the location. That approval could be three to four years out. For purposes of this Application, an approval is requested by May, 2012 so that the school can accept new students for this fall. He mentioned that the enrollment is growing.

Mr. Zarin stated that 61 percent of the students are dropped off. Mr. Sjunneemark commented that if the students are in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades, would they not have an interest in driving themselves to school. Mr. Mendes agreed and said that kids at that age are uncomfortable having their parents drive them to school. Mr. Zabin said he will look into this further and report back. He then said that there are 49 parking spaces and only 16 spaces are needed.

Mr. Wexler stated that this is a congested area already. Also, at the start of the school day at 8:00 a.m., additional motorists could interfere with morning commuters trying to get to the railroad station on time. He then inquired how many vehicles will be added to the roadway. Mr. Zarin said 90 to 100. The Board requested a traffic study at Waverly Avenue and Fenimore Road.

Mr. Zarin said that the M-1 zone has mixed and diverse uses such as 23% for residential, 28% for general services, 17% for auto, and the balance for manufacturing and other. He said that this is not a heavy industrial area, and that the truck traffic is light. Mr. Steinman requested a truck traffic study for the area.

Mr. Graham Trelstead came forward and addressed the safety of the children. He said that sidewalks are plentiful, and the school kids will likely go to nearby deli's, and are capable of obeying traffic signals.

Ms. Favate stated that if an approval is granted, that it be a temporary special use permit. Mr. Zarin said that he is good with the recommendation but noted that there could be a need for a one-year extension at the end of four years.

Mr. Zabin stated that they have gone before the ZBA for renewals. He noted that there have not been any complaints from neighbors who live by the school on New Street.

Mr. Ianniello commented that being in a flood plain area could impact the children if there is flooding. Three to four years with a possible one-year extension would be the maximum allotted time.

Mr. Sjunneemark noted that approximately 105 students will be dropped off, and requested a circulation plan. He suggested that all parking be moved over to the far right side so that there is no interference with school busses.

Mr. Mendes raised a concern that there will not be many students walking to the school from the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Sterk questioned the busing of children who are brought in from other areas. He remarked that there will be more than two busses in the morning and more than two busses in the afternoon. Mr. Zabin said that he will research further and report back.

Mr. Zabin said that he will present a site plan drawing and an operations plan. Mr. Sterk questioned if it is appropriate to rezone the area for this purpose. Mr. Wexler said there are site plan issues as the area is already congested. He asked if there could be a drop off point on Fenimore Road.

Mr. Ianniello said that the Board of Trustees will make the final decision and they have requested to be the lead agency. He noted that the HCZMC has concurred.

Mr. Messinger said that this is a preliminary meeting and wanted to get the Planning Board's feedback on the proposed Application.

Mr. Sjunneemark moved to concur with the Board of Trustees intent to be the lead agency, seconded by Mr. Sterk.

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

## **10. OTHER**

Mr. Steinman stated that a revised site plan was submitted by the architect on record for 1301 Flagler Drive. The Application was approved on July 13, 2011, and the Resolution was approved on July 25, 2011. He recommended an amendment to the Resolution that will include the revised site plan. The Board so agreed.

Mr. Sterk moved to approve an Amendment to the Resolution dated July 25, 2011, for 1301 Flagler Drive, Mamaroneck, NY, and subject to the inclusion of the revised site plan, and an executed revised site plan, seconded by Mr. Sjunneemark.

Village of Mamaroneck

Planning Board

February 22, 2012

Page 13 of 14

Vote:

Ayes: Mendes, Sjunneemark, Sterk, Wexler, Ianniello

Nays: None

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no other business, and on motion of Mr. Sjunneemark, seconded by Mr. Sterk, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Hohlweck

Recording Secretary