

**Village of Woodbury
Planning Board Meeting
May 5, 2021**

Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting held on May 5, 2021, at 7:30PM
(Meeting held via Zoom)

Board Members Present: Christopher Gerver, Chairman
Robert Anzalone
Richard Cataggio
Sandra Capriglione
Thomas Deluca

Representing for the Village of Woodbury Planning Board:

Richard Golden, Attorney
Natalie D. Barber, Engineer
Jonathan Lockman, Planner

Board Member(s) Absent: None

Chairman Gerver opened the meeting with Pledge of Allegiance.

1. **Executive Session:** No Executive Session was necessary.
2. **Public Comment:** No member of the public had comments.
3. **Approval and Acceptance of Previous Minutes:**

A motion was offered by T. Deluca, seconded by R. Cataggio, to approve and accept the minutes of the meeting held April 21, 2021. Chairperson Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES 5 Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cataggio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca
NOES 0

Regarding some of the applications in this meeting, Chairman Gerver said there were number of submissions that was received by the Building Department. It was way passed the due date; not leaving enough time for the Planning Board or the consultants to review these submissions. Therefore, the consultants will not be able to speak on any of the newly received submissions.

4. Regular Agenda:

- A. **Hartman/Hudson Pointe ARB** – Review and discuss ARB application for proposed addition to an existing single-family dwelling. Said property is located 9 Hudson Pointe and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 255 Block 1 Lot 2.

Architect Larry Hartman representing the applicant said his client wants to an add an addition. The addition happens to be to be part of a ridge preservation area, therefore an ARB is required. They are seeking for the approval from the Planning Board for the addition. Architect Hartman said he has tried to have the home to blend in with other existing homes in the area. He gave a brief description of what the addition would look like and its location in the home. He said they will follow and use the same materials the existing home has as well as color. Architect Hartman mentioned the windows, he said the new windows will be non-glare windows just like the existing ones.

Village Planner Jonathan Lockman began to go over his comments in his memo dated April 30, 2021. He said the Planning Board needs to determine whether the home blends well in it surrounding area. He continued to speak on color, roof materials, and windows. He said although the applicant spoke of using non-glare windows it should reflect on the new resubmitted drawing. The applicant should confirm of any vegetation clearing or of any removal of trees greater than 8 inches is included since its standard. He asked the Board to review the homes in the vicinity and said when doing an addition, photographs of the surrounding area should be provided.

Planner Lockman recommend it be a Type II action SEQRA. He said GML 239 is not required. Attorney Richard Golden thinks it too soon to determine if it's as a Type II action since the use has not been determined. He requested more information and specifics to the intended use of the addition and agreed with Planner Lockman as per the GML 239.

Chairman Gerver asked Architect Hartman if he can comment on the intended use of the addition. Architect Hartman said he is aware of the Board's concern, but he confirmed with his client that it would be only a single-family residential use. The client has a large family and confirms that it won't be used other than a single-family residential.

As per the rendering shown on the screen, Chairman Gerver asked about a door a few feet away from the garage door. Architect Hartman said it was a mudroom entry. He continued to explain the location of the door and confirmed it was a mudroom entry the client always wanted. S. Capriglione asked about the roof over the garage. She wanted to know if it was a sukkah roof and Architect Hartman said yes that its part of the existing home. She asked if it was going to be removed/changed and Architect Hartman said no, it will stay as is. S. Capriglione then asked for the measurements for the addition since the plans seem to be missing measurements. Planner Lockman noted a page on the plan where it talks about 3,000 square-ft. Architect Hartman spoke of the calculations of the mezzanine. Attorney Golden asked how is a mezzanine a typical family use. Architect Hartman said the client already has a mezzanine as part of his client's study. He pointed it out on the plans that were being shown on the screen. S. Capriglione asked about the windows on the plans (page was given). She said there was a lot of windows and Architect Hartman pointed out the existing windows and the windows that will be added. She was concerned on the brightness coming out from those windows located on the side of the home as well as the driveway. She said the driveway looked like it went all the way to the addition and Architect Hartman said there won't be any changes to the driveway. He then confirmed the rendering was a picture of the home and the addition was added on to the photo. He continued to explain the layout of the driveway. Confirming at the end the driveway will stay as is.

S. Capriglione brought up the address of the home. She noticed on the application the property address has Monroe zip code, she asked if it should be Woodbury or Central Valley. Planner Lockman said there are difference in Village boundaries, but he will investigate it. It was noted by Lockman that it would be of no surprise if the property would be in Village Tax Map but for purposes of the US postal service for it to be Monroe. Attorney Golden said it depends on what's being asked, if the question is your address and its properly Monroe then the application is correct that way. If asked what Village or Town, then it would be Woodbury.

T. Deluca asked if the applicant in the future chooses to change the use. Chairman Gerver said the applicant would have to appear before the Planning Board and conform to whatever special use.

R. Anzalone asked if he can have the square footage of the homes on the sides and across from the home to make a comparison to the size of the unit to be. Chairman Gerver gave some suggestions on how to make those comparisons using Google Maps and Architect Hartman said agreed to do it. Chairman Gerver asked Architect Hartman can get all what is required of him in the next few weeks so a public hearing can be scheduled, and he said yes.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerber, seconded by T. Deluca, to schedule a public hearing for June 2, 2021. Chairperson Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES 5 Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cataggio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca
NOES 0

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by R. Cataggio, to recognize it is a Type II Action SEQRA. Chairperson Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES 5 Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cataggio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca
NOES 0

- B. Feldman/Southfield Falls ARB** - Review and discuss ARB application for proposed addition to an existing single-family dwelling. Said property is located 77 Southfield Falls and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 255 Block 4 Lot 2.

Architect Gedalya Feldman began to give a brief description of what his client would like to do to the home. They are adding a sukkah room in the back of the house, change the location of the kitchen by removing the existing garage, and adding a new garage.

Planner Lockman spoke of his comments on his memo dated April 30, 2021. He spoke of the initial submissions missing floor plans for the second level. On the projected sewer water demand there are no extra bedrooms. He acknowledged receiving late submissions, but he could not review them. He continues to things that should be noted on the application, the property is in a conservation cluster overlay, the square footage of the existing dwelling, the square footage of the addition as well as lot coverage (should not exceed 35% of natural impervious areas). He continued to speak on the following...

NPV Memo:

Bulk requirements

a. The property is zoned Residential, One-Acre district (R-1A) and is in the Conservation Cluster Development Overlay district (CCDOD). The Planning Board application should be updated to indicate that the property is in the CCDOD as well as R-1A.

b. Lot coverage. The site plan should be updated to show the square footage of the existing dwelling and additions.

c. Per Section 310-31.1.D(4), the maximum lot coverage is governed by R-0.25 standards. Lot coverage for buildings and impervious surfaces shall not exceed 35 percent of the lot area. Existing and proposed lot coverage should be shown on the site plan.

d. Lot Area and Yard Requirements. The lot area and yard requirements are stipulated on sheet OP-3 of the final plan for WP3 Subdivision from April of 2007. The subject lot, which is shown on the final plan as FM LOT ME 267, must meet the following standards: 30,000 sf lot area; 40' front yard; 15' side yard; and 35' rear yard. It appears the proposed addition meets these requirements.

e. Lot Width. Review Sheet OP-3 of the final subdivision plans from April of 2007 show the lot size is unchanged and meets lot width requirements.

f. Building Height. The building height should be labelled on sheets A5 and A6. Per Section 310- 7, the building height shall not exceed 35 feet.

As per ridge preservation he said the Board needs to decide whether the addition blends into the hillside along with the propose cream color for the vinyl siding the client is proposing. The bark wood shingles are proposed which appears to meet the standard. The glass needs to be confirmed that it will not be reflective and that there will be no vegetation clearing or removal of over 8 inch or greater trees. Planner Lockman suggest that the surrounding homes be photographed to decide whether the addition to this home is keeping up with the surrounding houses. He said on an approved lot this will be a Type II Action SEQRA since its two additions to a single-family home. He finished by saying he doesn't see this to qualify as a GML 239 review.

Architect Feldman said today he provided the plans for the second floor as well as the colors to match most of the homes in area. This goes for the shingles as well; he will try to match the existing shingles. He admitted the renderings are brighter than the existing home. Chairman Gerver asked if its vinyl siding and Architect Feldman said yes. Architect Feldman said he wants to try to match the existing color(s), shutters, etc. so that the two additions are not so obvious.

Chairman Gerver suggested to Architect Feldman to give an overview of the house from above just like the previous applicant, outlining in red the additions with the square footage. Planner Lockman added that he should take photos of the surrounding homes so that the Board can see it fits with the other homes in the neighborhood.

Architect Feldman agreed to do as required. S. Capriglione asked that the Architect to provide renderings of the back of the home due to other constructions in the area.

Attorney Golden asked that this be made into a Type II Action SEQRA and so it can be easier on the Building Inspector Gary Thomasberger it should be enforced in the Resolution of Approval as a condition. Stating the new vinyl siding is to match and be no brighter than the existing color beige or cream vinyl siding and the new roof shall match the existing color shingles. All agreed. Architect listed the things he will provide to the Board as per the Board's request. The colors to match, the renderings of the back of the home, and the google sketch. He agreed to provide the information to the Building Department by May 19, 2021, to proceed to a public hearing.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by R. Anzalone, to schedule a public hearing for June 2, 2021. Chairperson Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES	5	Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cataggio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca
NOES	0	

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by S. Capriglione, to recognize its a Type II Action SEQRA. Chairperson Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES	5	Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cataggio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca
NOES	0	

- C. **CVPM** – Review and discuss letter requesting that the previously approved Site Plan and Special Permit be amended to include personal service. Said property is located at 252-260 Route 32 in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 230 Block 7 Lot 17, 18 and 19.

Engineer Steve Esposito representing the applicant began saying the building is complete and they are starting to occupy the building. They are present today to ask the Planning Board to add personal service as permitted use in the schedule uses. The "Personal Service" use has the same bulk requirements, land area or lot area consistent with retail and office, but the original approval had 7100 square ft. of retail and office with a balance being designated for restaurants. He said their request is consistent with the purpose of the Hamlet Zone which is to provide retail services to commercial centers. He said the original approval back in 2019 for the Bank building (which is part of this approval) 2400 square ft. was for retail. A client wanted to designate it as a personal service, a review was done and a re-analysis of parking with personal service. The numbers on the original park parking and shared parking analysis did not change based on the change of use. He is asking the Board to allow them to amend the map and have personal service as a permitted use for this project. He currently has someone who is interested in opening a barber shop for about 1000 square ft., which is why they are appearing in front of the Board.

Engineer Barber agreed that the additional personal service use won't affect the bulk requirements, the land area, or the parking spaces. She noted in her memo that the Board may consider whether a revised shared parking analysis would be necessary. If so, she suggests referring to Maser Consulting for some input prior to the next meeting with the applicant. The change would affect the water and sewer usage especially for a barber shop. Should the Board request, the applicant should provide that information. She said there won't be any modifications to the ARB but asked for Engineer Esposito to confirm. Using the barber shop as an example Engineer Barber thought of the hours of operation. The Board may want to confirm that as well.

Chairman Gerver shared his concerns with the shared parking. He said the shared parking analysis that was given to the Board to review doesn't match the parking spots that are being used. He noted there are 11-15 cars parked in any given day due to the apartments that are rented, so more spots are being used than in the shared parking analysis. He has mentioned this before, he doesn't think the parking is adequate. The parking spots are used without a single retail/commercial establishment in there. He had to call the Building Inspector Thomasberger twice because he's seen cars without license plates nor registration and its concerning. Shared parking analysis needs to be updated.

R. Anzalone asked what other type of personal services could be put into these units. Engineer Barber mentioned her list in her memo that would be covered under the code.

H2M Memo dated April 29, 2021:

Site Plan/Special Permit – Based on the applicant’s correspondence there are no changes to the site plan and the effect on the existing approval is primarily a function of the special permit operations.

a) Narrative – The Code defines a “personal service” as “An establishment primarily engaged in providing services involving the specialized care of a person or a person’s apparel, including but not limited to beauty shop, nail salon, barber shop, tailor shop or exercise, martial arts or dance studio.” If details are known, specific information on the proposed tenant of the personal service use, the area of the building that may be occupied as personal service, hours of operation, etc should be provided to consider the parking and water/sewer requirements.

b) Water/Sewer – In consideration of the operations for a personal service use, as opposed to a retail/office use, we note the demand for water and sewer may vary. The applicant should provide an updated water and sewer demand calculation for your consideration.

Attorney Golden noted the examples Engineer Barber used can serve as an example of what can fit under those categories.

Planner Lockman had previously asked Engineer Esposito to provide a bulk table on the site plan, so the definition can be shown. He said he believes Engineer Esposito intention is to have personal use as well as retail use under the 7,161 sq. ft.

T. Deluca asked if the number of chairs in a barber shop dictate the amount of chair therefore space. Planner Lockman said no, it goes by the square ft. The square footage requirement for parking is identical to the requirement of parking, parking for retail, parking for an office and for personal services. These different uses are required to have the same amount of parking. Mr. Golden said if the applicant is set on having personal service use, then the applicant should really consider the maximum personal service use. That would analyze the parking that's necessary for that and he potential overlap. Many examples of types of use were discussed and it came down to the concern of parking. By having a barber shop, nail salon and a bouncy house they see the parking lot at full capacity with vehicles belonging to owners, employees, and customers. Engineer Barber suggest the applicant to have a revised shared parking analysis for a barber shop and say a martial art where parents drop off and pick up. Also, an analysis on the water and sewer projections. Previously Engineer Esposito may have offered to reserve a thousand sq. ft. for personal use, she said that can be part of the Board's action and limiting that so when another barber shop comes in, they would have to appear in front of the Board for more area. Attorney Golden agreed and talked about a scenario.

Chairman Gerver asked would the restrictions to this project overall only allowed 1,000 sq. ft of personal use. Engineer Esposito clarified that is not what they are requesting, they simply would like to add personal service as a permitted use. Planner Lockman stated the the space is currently reserved for retail/office 7,161 sq. ft. adding personal service use. Attorney Golden said the more flexibility in the approval the more complicated it will be for the Board, bear in mind the personal service use would be for the entire building. Chairman Gerver thinks the Board should protect the overall Village where the shared parking analysis that already does not go with what's going on real world.

Planner Lockman asked how does Engineer Esposito anticipate leasing in the main building, would he be adjusting the size of the units or will he further be splitting them. Engineer Esposito said a portion of the 7,161 sq. ft. will be designated to restaurants and the balance was for retail and office. He said the market will determine where those partition walls are going to go. The goal is to provide a building that has flexibility to meet market demand. He continues to say their request is consistent with the purpose of the Hamlet District, which is to provide mixed use of residential commercial. His request is compliant with the code. Engineer Barber said the Board already granted a waiver for parking, the requirement based on shared parking analysis which is why this request changes the use and what is required and what should be available for peak times.

Chairman Gerver asked if there should be a shared parking analysis based on all the uses. Engineer Barber said it could be a multiple analysis showing all retail, all personal service or mix or the two. She mentions Traffic Consultant Phillip Grealy lending a hand in sorting the analysis and what would be appropriate as far as what those worse scenarios would be.

R. Anzalone asked Engineer Barber why was personal service use left out at the very beginning. She said it was the applicant's original request which was retail office and restaurant. Then the applicant came back for the TD Bank from retail office to personal service use. S. Capriglione asked if the limitations on the restaurant use was settled, and they all said yes. Engineer Esposito added at 1600 sq. ft.

Chairman Gerver summed up what's needed. Shared parking analysis based on worst case scenarios. Engineer Esposito said in this shared parking analysis the TD Bank will be included (whole site).

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by T. Deluca, to amend the Type II Action SEQR. Chairperson Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES	5	Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cataggio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca
NOES	0	

Engineer Barber will work with the Building Department for the GML 239 referral.

- D. **WC/Ralph Lauren Coffee Truck** – Review and discuss proposed Amended Site Plan, Special Permit for the relocation of Ralph’s Coffee kiosk and interior renovation of Polo Ralph Lauren retail store for associated “back of house” to support said kiosk. Said property is located within Woodbury Common at 283 Red Apple Court in Central Valley and is known on the Village of Woodbury Tax Maps as Section 225-1-70.2.

General– The applicant proposes to abandon the prior site approval at the Polo site and relocate the coffee “truck” approved in 2020 to the Niagara Court kiosk location that was abandoned as part of the 2018 approval. The applicant also proposes to renovate an area of the existing Polo Ralph Lauren store to serve as a “back-of-house” for the coffee truck. The applicant’s narrative suggests the “back-of-house” area would be used for light food and beverage preparation for the coffee truck. The space would include new kitchen equipment, including sinks, coffee/ice machines, refrigerator, and freezer. The distance between the proposed “back-of-house” area and coffee “truck” is approximately 1,110-ft and crosses one driveway entrance from Ring Road to the inner/western parking area of Woodbury Common.

From Simon Property Group, Vice President of Construction Bill Pendergast representing the applicant introduced the team, Developer John Dionis and from Ralph Lauren Aaron Vomberg. The coffee truck was previously approved for a location outside of the Polo Store. When developing the plan, there is an extensive sewer and water issue becoming an impacting the cost of providing the kiosk. They are thinking to move it temporarily for 2 years to at site near the Levi's store which was a previously approved location for a kiosk. It currently has water, sewer and electric available. There's also a back house area that they want to develop to provide refrigeration, food storage, cleaning products.

A plan was shared on the screen and Mr. Pendergast continue to explain the route from the existing store to the new location. The travel about 1,100 ft. four times a day. One in the morning before anyone is in the center and one would be at night when it’s shut down, and two during the day. He said it be all hands-on carts, no golf carts, or motorized vehicles. The carts are like those for picking up garbage. He said both sites have been approved and both have ARB and has had a review in terms of site plan. Mr. Pendergast said he has met with the Building Inspector Thomasberger and discussed the terms of the ESO and there were no issues.

Planner Lockman said the applicant's plan is unclear. He asked if there's an existing kiosk in the new location for the coffee truck. He asked if there was a shaved ice vendor in that new location. Mr. Pendergast said he will provide a more detailed site plan, especially since that was something Engineer Barber brought up in her comments.

Planner Lockman said it would be helpful if Mr. Pendergast can show both approvals, the coffee truck on the east of the courtyard of Ralph Lauren as well the proposed Niagara site. Mr. Pendergast said they can do that. As per Engineer Barber's request, Mr. Pendergast said will provide an updated plan, showing the approved kiosk locations. If the location is approved, they would like to keep the location in front of Polo. It will not be used for any other purpose other than Ralph's Coffee when it moved back. Mr. Pendergast said an information booth was recently updated to a retail kiosk. He will be updating the kiosk plan as well.

Planner Lockman began to go over the NPV memo dated April 30, 2021.

NPV Memo:

Submissions

2. The package did not include an elevation of the east side of the building where the façade will be changed to accommodate the new employee doorway to the right of the current east entrance. For Architectural Review Board purposes, please show an elevation of the east side of the Ralph Lauren store, including the new proposed doorway for the service area (see sheet D101, note 9, where a portion of the exterior wall will be removed).

3. It appears that the SBL numbers are incorrect on the first page of the application and should be corrected.

4. We note that the "food truck" kiosk approved in September 2020 was not included in the "Woodbury Common Premium Outlets Overall Kiosk Plan," submitted with this application and should be indicated. It is unclear whether the applicant intends to abandon this approval.

He asks Mr. Pendergast to provide a site plan displaying the area of the Niagara kiosk location. He'd like to see the furniture, the planters and so forth. He said its best to defer to the Building Inspector Thomasberger determination on the GLA (Gross Lease Area). He mentioned Engineer Barber sending prior approvals and resolutions. The resolution dated May 30, 2018; site plan included a forfeit of a kiosk in Niagara Court. He suggest that the prior amendments are revisit and cleared up.

Chairman Gerver asked if its the same coffee truck, and if its just moving to a different location. Mr. Pendergast said its the same coffee truck to be moved to a new location that had prior approval. Mr. Pendergast said they abandoned the GLA component but not the location.

Attorney Golden wanted to clarify because in he doesn't see it as an approved location at all. He said it was a previously approved but abandoned location. Mr. Pendegast argument is that it was an approved location. Attorney Golden understood that the applicant does not want to abandon the current location of the coffee truck kiosk, where it was intended to be. Now the applicant wishes to use the coffee truck kiosk and go to another location. That is fine, but the other location must be approved by the Planning Board. He said the prior approval is meaningless because it was abandoned.

T. Deluca asked was the new location given up because of the GLA. Attorney Golden said he thinks they just gave it up. S. Capriglione said they gave it up and moved that GLA to another spot and not they'd like to put a kiosk there to increase the GLA. Engineer Barber agreed with S. Capriglione. She said the Niagara Kiosk was abandoned in 2018 and the GLA was allocated to the Saratoga kiosk. She continues to say the kiosk in Niagara it has the water and sewer connections. Reinstating that location does not change the GLA, because the coffee truck was approved for 194 GLA. The applicant has 10 authorized kiosk booth and that's including the coffee truck location, the information booth and eight other locations along with 5 alternative kiosk locations. For things to work out, she said that all the operation kiosks must be within the approved GLA. She'll investigate it but believes the GLA is 2,196. Therefore, she believes there will be minimal disturbance to the site for the coffee truck. Chairman Gerver asked about the ESO, and Engineer Barber said they did submit it and if others did not receive it, she will pass it on. The traffic back and forth between the back of house cross an ESO path and Mr. Pendegast confirmed it.

Planner Lockman recalled Mr. Pendegast comment on bringing the coffee truck back to the location by the Polo store. He asked what will happen at the Niagara location. Mr. Pendergast said in 2 years he will return the coffee truck back to its original location and only if approved they would put another kiosk at Niagara.

Chairman Gerver asked Attorney Golden is it simple as to taking away the approval from the previous spot, making it a void to then re-approving the spot for hte just the coffee are they only approving the spot for the coffee truck. Attorney Golden said that was one way, another is to try to come up with a resolution that would give a go ahead and approve the new location for 2 years, at the same time not able to use the one prior. After 2 years the approvals can swap back. Another suggestion was to approve both sites at the same time so any approval would have to have the condition that negates the other approval.

S. Capriglione asked if they will be able to keep the GLA that was approval of the coffee truck back n 2020 by moving it to a different location. Will it still count as a GLA even though its not used. Engineer Barber said no, only the GLA that's being used as a leasable area. She said 194 sq. ft. was designated for the coffee truck, if they installed it at the Niagara location it would be 194 sq. ft. in that location.

Chairman Gerver has an issue with having both sites approved at the same time especially for 2 years. Engineer Barber said the Board can have it as a condition, the approved coffee truck could only be located at the Niagara Court for 2 years to then be reviewed on an annual basis as a special permit by the Building Inspector Thomasberger. T. Deluca suggested to only approved the Niagara location for 2 years or more, abandon the other location and if they choose to go back, they will have to reapply. The Board agreed.

Engineer Barber listed the items that need to be done by the applicant. An amended site plan, kiosk plan showing all the active locations, approved locations and alternates including information booth(s) that were approved. Chairman Gerver asked Mr. Pendergast if that can be done by May 19th so a public hearing can be scheduled, and he said yes it can be done. Mr. Pendergast asked Attorney Golden if a public hearing is necessary. Attorney Golden said the code states it, that if you are in need amend a site plan or special permit, the Board is to hold a public hearing.

S. Capriglione asked if the seating area that was approved in 2020 will match the seating area in the Niagara Court location. Mr. Pendergast said there is seating in the area already. He will go over it with Polo just to see if they plan to add another seating, but he doesn't think it will be much. The plan will be updated for the next submission.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by R. Anzalone, to schedule a public hearing for June 2, 2021. Chairperson Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES	5	Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cataggio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca
NOES	0	

Attorney Golden said the application of moving the kiosk location does not change the prior SEQR approval, therefore the Board is just re-establishing the prior SEQR findings approval.

A motion was offered by Chairman Gerver, seconded by S. Capriglione, to reaffirm prior SEQR findings and approvals for this application. Chairperson Gerver conducted a roll call of the Board which resulted in the motion being:

ADOPTED

AYES	5	Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cataggio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca
NOES	0	

Chairman Gerver stated that the GML must go out. Attorney Golden agreed. Mr. Pendergast understood what needs to be done by May 19, 2021.

Adjournment:

With no further business to discuss, a motion was offered by T. Deluca, seconded by S. Capriglione, to adjourn the meeting at 9:26 PM.

ADOPTED

AYES 5

NOES 0

Chairperson Gerver, R. Anzalone, R. Cattagio, S. Capriglione, T. Deluca

Claudia Valoy-Romanisin, Planning Board Secretary