TOWN OF GREENBURGH
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
GREENBURGH – NEW YORK
Wednesday – January 20, 2021

The Work Session of the Planning Board of the Town of Greenburgh began at 5:01 pm on Wednesday, January 20, 2021, online via Zoom-enabled Video Conference, and was simulcast over cable television and the Town of Greenburgh website.

1. **ROLL CALL & ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Present: Chairperson Walter Simon, Hugh Schwartz, Kirit Desai, Mona Fraitag, Michael Golden, Thomas Hay, and Johan Snaggs

Absent:

Staff: Aaron Schmidt, Deputy Commissioner, CD&C
Garrett Duquesne, AICP, Commissioner, CD&C
David Fried, Esq., 1st Deputy Town Attorney
Matthew Britton, Assistant Planner, CD&C

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairperson Simon stated that he had two corrections to the January 6, 2021 draft minutes. First, at the start of the second paragraph on page 1 under Correspondence, he requested that "suggested" be changed to "stated". Second, he noted a grammatical error on page 1. Chairperson Simon asked if there were any additional comments. Mr. Hay requested clarification on what was meant by the term "electrified water," and asked if that is what was stated at the meeting. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the term was stated at the meeting. Mr. Schwartz replied that his concern related to water becoming electrified when used as part of fighting a fire associated with the battery energy storage system. Mr. Desai observed that in the fourth paragraph of the page 5, in the explanation of how the proposal meets coverage requirements, he did not see an explanation of how the applicant was using acreage from the conservation easement towards lot coverage. Mr. Schmidt stated that he would revisit the recording and add the explanation if it was stated.

On a motion made by Mr. Hay and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2021 work session, as amended.

3. **CORRESPONDENCE**

a. **Case No. PB 19-03** BMR – Ardsley Park, *410-460 Saw Mill River Road (P.O. Ardsley, N.Y.) – 4th Extension Request*

Chairperson Simon reported that the applicant has not been able to obtain an endorsement of its plat by the Westchester County Department of Health, noting that it was traditional for the Planning Board to grant an extension if a delay is caused by another government agency. Mr. Hay asked if 90 days would be a long enough extension. Mr. Fried responded that the Board could consider issuing a longer extension, but that 90 days would be keeping in line with New York State regulations regarding subdivisions.

On a motion made by Chairperson Simon and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to grant a further 90-day extension of the Planning Board's preliminary subdivision approval, valid through April 29, 2021.

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

a. **Case No. TB 21-01** Richard Bailey School Playground Construction, *33 Hillside Avenue (P.O. White Plains, N.Y.) – Recreation Fee Use Request*

A work session to discuss a recommendation to the Town Board regarding the proposed use of up to $75,000 of recreation escrow funds for the construction of a playground at the Richard J. Bailey Elementary School.

Commissioner Gerard Byrne, of the Department of Parks and Recreation, stated that the recreation fee use request is to install a playground on surplus school property at the RJ Bailey School, located on Hillside Avenue. He explained that a bond to sell the property had been voted down and that the school had reached an agreement with the Department of Parks and Recreation to contribute $75,000 towards building a new playground, where the Town would provide additional funding, up to $75,000. Commissioner Byrne noted that a requirement of the playground would be that it could hold summer day camp from the Theodore D Young Community Center. He reported that, at its January 6, 2021 meeting, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board passed a resolution recommending the disbursement of up to $75,000 in recreation escrow funds for this project. Commissioner Byrne noted that this project previously had been identified to the Planning Board as a potential project, and reported that the recreation escrow fee fund has $543,883 remaining within it. He stated that the area of the playground has been designated as surplus school property and that some pruning of trees would be required. He presented a conceptual playground plan, projected to cost approximately $150,000, which would be ADA compliant. He reported that the Greenburgh Central School District Board passed a resolution to work with the Town Board to build a playground at this site yesterday.

Mr. Schwartz asked what is meant by "surplus property". Commissioner Byrne replied that, in order to enter into an agreement with a school district, the school district must file an application with the New York State Education Department, stating that on its property, this land is considered surplus property and that it will be entering into an agreement with the municipality to put in recreational equipment on this land. Mr. Schwartz asked what would happen to the playground if the school were to be sold. Mr. Fried responded that if it were to cease being utilized as a playground or if its use were to become restricted, the school district would be required to pay back the depreciated value of the equipment.

Ms. Fraitag asked who would be responsible for liability. Mr. Fried responded that, generally, the school district would be responsible, but if the Town were operating an event there, specific arrangements would be made. Ms. Fraitag asked who has ultimate control over the budget and final design. Commissioner Byrne replied that the Department of Parks and Recreation has been consulting with the school and the department had hired an outside consultant to assist in programming. Commissioner Byrne stated that the next step is to finalize the proposal with the school district leadership. Mr. Michael Falcone, Director of Buildings and Grounds for Greenburgh Central School District, stated that the principal of Richard J. Bailey School has been involved and been provided a copy of the conceptual plans.

Mr. Desai asked how Town residents would be able to access the playground, and questioned if they would be permitted to utilize the parking lot. Chairperson Simon responded that the agreement is for when the school is not in session, so parking would be available. Commissioner Byrne noted that there is no gate at the property and that signage of the hours of usage for Town residents could be posted.

Mr. Schmidt reported that he forwarded a voicemail from Ms. Patricia Weems to Commissioner Byrne, and asked for his response. Commissioner Byrne stated that the first question asked if it was a good idea to be building a playground when the school is closed. He responded that while the high school is closed, the R. J. Bailey School is open. The second question asked if something similar had been proposed at the Highview School District gym, which had been turned down by New York State. Commissioner Byrne replied that the Department of Parks and Recreation has not proposed any projects at Highview with parkland funds during his 29 year career with the Town. Mr. Fried clarified that if the question pertained to a gymnasium, that likely would be why New York State turned down the funding, as a proposal of that type would be indoors and not on surplus school property. Chairperson Simon noted that this current proposal appears to be following all required criteria.

Chairperson Simon asked Commissioner Byrne to update the spreadsheet of potential future projects and to provide a copy to the Planning Board once prepared. Commissioner Byrne agreed that he would do so.

On a motion made by Mr. Schwartz and seconded by Mr. Desai, the Planning Board unanimously voted to issue a positive recommendation to the Town Board for the release of up to $75,000 of recreation escrow funds for the construction of a playground at the Richard J. Bailey Elementary School.

5. ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Full transcripts of the items on for public hearing and public discussion will be made available through the Department of Community. Development and Conservation, and will be posted on the Town of Greenburgh website.

a. Case No. PB 20-04 Casale, *34-40 & 50 Saw Mill River Road (P.O. Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y.) – Preliminary Subdivision, Site Plan, and Planning Board Steep Slope Permit*

A public hearing to discuss a preliminary subdivision, site plan, and Planning Board steep slope permit application for a proposal consisting of the resubdivision of three (3) existing tax lots (8.610-421-72, 8.610-421-73, and 8.610-421-74) into one (1) lot. The applicant proposes to modify the layout of the site by moving storage bins to more efficient locations, adding off-street parking spaces, adding storage locations, and related site improvements. The applicant proposes approximately 2,900 sq. ft. of disturbance to 35%+ slopes (EXCESSIVELY STEEP SLOPES). The project requires approximately 385 cubic yards of excavation. On December 17, 2020, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted area variances required in connection with the project. The properties consist of approximately 45,302 sq. ft. (1.04 acres) and are situated on the east side of Saw Mill River Road between Farragut Avenue and Holly Place. The properties are located in the LI Light Industrial District and are designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 8.610-421-72, 8.610-421-73, and 8.610-421-74.

On a motion made by Mr. Desai and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to close the public hearing and to keep the written record open through January 27, 2021.

6. OLD BUSINESS

a. Case No. PB 20-08 Greystone PUD, *Carriage Trail (P.O. Tarrytown, N.Y.) – Site Plan and Planning Board Steep Slope Permit*

A work session to discuss the decision of a Planning Board site plan and steep slope permit application for a proposal consisting of the buildout of a residential development site with a total of ten (10) primary residences and twelve (12) accessory residences. The applicant previously petitioned for, and was granted a zoning change to, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) District, allowing for multiple dwellings on a single lot (Case No. TB 19-02). The applicant previously received a Planning Board steep slope permit in connection with a prior subdivision approval (Case No. PB 11-13). As part of the updated buildout of the site, the applicant now proposes approximately 10,000 sq. ft. of additional regulated steep slope disturbance to Lot 11, associated with the reorientation of the driveway layout. The properties consist of approximately 2,463,675 sq. ft. (56.6 acres) and are situated on the east side of Broadway (NYS Rt. 9). The subject properties are located in the PUD Planned Unit Development District and are designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 7.290-141-9.1, 7.290-141-9.2, 7.290-141-9.3, 7.290-141-9.4, 7.290-141-9.5, 7.290-141-9.6, 7.300-142-3.7, 7.300-142-3.8, 7.300-142-3.9, 7.300-142-3.10, 7.300-142-3.11, and 7.300-142-3.12.

Mr. Schmidt noted that conditions requested by the Village of Tarrytown had been incorporated into the draft decision prepared by staff for the Board's consideration this evening. Chairperson Simon

asked if there were any comments on the draft SEQRA determination or approval documents. There were none.

On a motion made by Chairperson Simon and seconded by Mr. Golden, the Planning Board unanimously voted to classify the proposed action as an Unlisted action, under SEQRA.

On a motion made by Mr. Golden and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to issue a negative declaration for this project, under SEQRA.

On a motion made by Mr. Schwartz and seconded by Mr. Hay, the Planning Board unanimously voted to approve the site plan application.

On a motion made by Chairperson Simon and seconded by Mr. Golden, the Planning Board unanimously voted to approve the steep slope permit application.

b. **Case No. TB 20-10/PB 20-21** Brightview-Metropolis, *289 Dobbs Ferry Road (P.O. White Plains, N.Y.) – Town Board Site Plan and Special Permit (referral to Planning Board), Preliminary Subdivision, Planning Board Steep Slope Permit, and Tree Removal Permit*
A continuation of a work session (January 6, 2021) to discuss a Town Board site plan and special permit (Town Board approvals – referral to Planning Board), preliminary 3-lot subdivision, Planning Board steep slope permit, and tree removal permit application for a project consisting of the proposed construction of a 155-unit (186 bed), approximately 174,571 sq. ft. Continuum of Care Facility on an approximately 5 acre lot (proposed Lot 2) of what currently is part of the Metropolis Country Club property. The applicant is proposing an approximately 3 acre lot (proposed Lot 3) adjacent and contiguous conservation easement area to meet the required 8 acres for a Continuum of Care Facility. Both new lots (Lots 2 & 3) are proposed as part of the preliminary subdivision application. The applicant proposes approximately 176,139 sq. ft. of disturbance to 15-25% slopes (STEEP SLOPES), approximately 29,259 sq. f.t of disturbance to 25-35% slopes (VERY STEEP SLOPES), and approximately 3,755 sq. ft. of disturbance to 35%+ slopes (EXCESSIVELY STEEP SLOPES). The applicant proposes the installation of Stormtech stormwater chambers and a detention pond to handle the additional stormwater runoff. The applicant proposes the removal of 192 regulated trees, requiring a tree removal permit, and has prepared a landscaping plan calling for the planting of 256 trees, as replacement. The properties consist of an approximately 217,831 sq. ft. (5 acres) lot to be developed and a conservation easement area consisting of approximately 137,882 sq. ft. (3.17 acres) and are situated on the southerly side of Dobbs Ferry Road, west of Sciortino Place. The properties are located in the R-15 and R-20 Zoning Districts and are designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 8.10-1-6, 8.141-94-15, 16, 17 & 18.

Mr. Fried announced that the Planning Board would be discussing site plan and special permit referral recommendations to the Town Board, noting that the preliminary subdivision, steep slope permit, and tree removal permit would be discussed at a future public hearing, presumed to be February 3, 2021. Mr. Schmidt clarified that the tree removal permit approval now rests with the Town Board as, under the new Town tree ordinance, the Board with site plan jurisdiction has authority over the tree removal permit. Mr. Schmidt stated that any tree-related conditions would be included in both the Planning Board and Town Board decisions.

Chairperson Simon asked if there were any comments on the draft recommendation prepared by staff. Mr. Schwartz stated that he would like a specific recommendation added that the landscape screening will maintain the privacy of neighbors. Mr. Diego Villareale, PE, of JMC PLLC, representing the applicant, advised that a note had been added to the plans indicating that landscaping would be field located and verified with the Town Forestry Officer to ensure proper screening. Ms. Fraitag noted that, in previous discussions on this project, she had inquired about additional ADA spaces, and asked

if additional spaces had been added to the plans. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that a recommendation for additional ADA spaces has been included in the draft recommendation to the Town Board. He added that Mr. Villareale had agreed to provide additional ADA accessible spaces on the plan. Mr. Villareale concurred. Ms. Fraitag asked if there would be enough on-site parking to handle holiday demand. Mr. Schmidt responded that it has been confirmed with Mr. John Canning, PE, of Kimley Horn, the Town's traffic consultant for this project, that there would be an adequate number of off-street parking spaces to handle the expected demand.

Mr. Desai requested clarification as to whether the 3.17 acre conservation easement could be included in lot and bulk calculations. Mr. David Cooper, Esq., of Zarin & Steinmetz, confirmed this as accurate. Mr. Desai asked if more than 3 acres could be used for the purposes of calculating lot and bulk requirements, either in this, or other, CCF proposals. Commissioner Duquesne replied that the Town Code limits the amount of conservation easement that can utilized in meeting the lot and bulk requirements, to no more than 3 acres.

On a motion made by Mr. Schwartz and seconded by Mr. Hay, the Planning Board unanimously voted to issue a positive recommendation to the Town Board on the site plan application, as amended.

On a motion made by Mr. Schwartz and seconded by Mr. Hay, the Planning Board unanimously voted to issue a positive recommendation to the Town Board on the special permit application, as amended.

On a motion made by Mr. Schwartz and seconded by Ms. Fraitag, the Planning Board unanimously voted to issue a positive recommendation to the Town Board on the applicant's requested waiver to permit shared driveway access.

On a motion made by Ms. Fraitag and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to issue a positive recommendation to the Town Board on the applicant's requested building height increase and reduction in parking setback to the northerly property line.

c. **Case No. TB 18-02** Elmwood Preserve, *850 Dobbs Ferry Road (P.O. White Plains N.Y.) – DEIS Review*

A continuation of a work session (November 18, 2020, and December 2, 2020) to discuss and formalize, as an Involved Agency, substantive comments and questions regarding the DEIS for a Zoning Map Petition (Zone Map change from R-30/R-20 to R-20, and Zoning Map change to Planned Unit Development - PUD; Town Board approval required) for a proposal consisting of a 175-unit townhouse development that would consist of age restricted (55+) housing. The existing zoning districts of the site yield a maximum 119 unit conventional one-family subdivision plan. Several alternative use and layout proposals were included in the DEIS. The site's development (if rezoned to a PUD) would require site plan (Planning Board approval). Development at the site will require Planning Board steep slope permit, wetland/watercourse permit, tree removal permit, and subdivision approval (Planning Board approvals). The approximately 107-acre subject site (850 Dobbs Ferry Road, P.O. White Plains, Parcel ID 7.530-320-1…SE and 1…SG) was a former golf course (Elmwood Country Club – Dobbs Ferry Road) which is no longer in existence. The property is located in the R-20 and R-30 One-Family Residence Districts and is designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 8.370-265-1, 8.370-265-2, 8.370-265-3 and 8.370-265-4.

Chairperson Simon stated that a list of questions from the Planning Board had been prepared and that this work session would be an opportunity to expand on, or add, any additional questions, which would be addressed as part of the applicant's Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). He stated that he would like to expand on the comment related to the applicant providing a centralized open space. He believes there is a layout that would enable a central open space while still allowing

for the parkland donation, and also remain financially attractive to the developer, while not significantly affecting the proposed buffer area. He noted that while numerous trails are proposed, as residents age, they may not be able to take as much advantage of these trails. Mr. Golden agreed that a central open space area is important, as residents having guests over could utilize the space. Mr. Schmidt noted that this had been captured in the draft document.

Ms. Fraitag advised that she is the only Planning Board member with a home in a 55+ community and noted that her community contains trails and multiple, smaller park-like areas, rather than one large area. She suggested that the applicant consider adding something similar to its plans. She additionally suggested that the applicant consider a combination of single-family houses and townhomes, noting that not all residents will be married and may want smaller homes.

Mr. Schwartz stated that the Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2016, states that the Town should not be increasing density in residentially zoned areas and, therefore, the applicant's proposal to downzone a portion of the site from an R-30 One-Family Residence District to an R-20 One-Family Residence District is inconsistent with the Plan. He requested that the applicant recalculate the maximum number of units, based on the underlying zoning. He stated that the FEIS should address the impact of the applicant's likely build-out, in addition to the legally required maximum build-out, as this would make it easier for the Town Board, Planning Board, and Conservation Advisory Council to assess the potential impacts of the project. Mr. Schwartz recalled that there is no desire from the applicant to construct a maximum build-out in terms of square footage, and opined that the applicant should provide details concerning what it actually proposes to build. Mr. Maximillian Mahalek, Esq., of Zarin & Steinmetz, representing the applicant, stated that the applicant will respond to all comments from the Planning Board in the FEIS. He noted that the maximum buildout square footage takes into account the basement of the homes and that clarification would be provided in the FEIS. Mr. Schwartz opined that the applicant would still have to do this analysis even if it is not required to do so, as the Planning Board would request it.

Mr. Schmidt stated that Ms. Fraitag's comments will be added to the document. Mr. Schwartz requested that the zoning issue be addressed in the document as well. Mr. Schmidt recited the question pertaining to Mr. Schwartz's comments, and asked if he would like to elaborate further. Mr. Schwartz requested that the question ask what the maximum build-out of units would be if the current R-20 and R-30 split zoning of the site were used. Commissioner Duquesne responded that if the site were re-zoned to a PUD, with the underlying R-20 & R-30 zoning remaining in place, the resulting calculation would result in 126 units. Mr. Schwartz asked if the re-zoning to a PUD would only yield seven (7) additional units as compared to a one-family residence layout plan. Commissioner Duquesne confirmed this as accurate.

Mr. Golden opined that the Board was negotiating between 126 units and 175 units, and that, in his view, the applicant could come up with a plan that contained more open space areas. Mr. Mahalek stated that a chart is provided in the DEIS which compares the applicant's preferred project layout and the various alternatives, which contains data related to unit counts and impervious surface coverage, among other data. Mr. Schwartz requested the applicant provide a comparison of the zoning compliant layouts for both the one-family residence and PUD re-zone developments, with and without the public park space. Mr. Mahalek responded that this request would be addressed in the FEIS.

Mr. Golden asked what the square footage of each unit would be. Mr. Mahalek replied that the average size would be 4,590 sq. ft., but noted that this figure includes the basement area, which is not required to be included as per Town regulations. Mr. Golden asked what the square footage would be without the basement. Mr. James Caris, AICP, of JMC PLLC, responded that the average unit size without the basement space would be about 3,000 sq. ft. Mr. Golden opined that 3,000 sq. ft. is a

large unit for a retired couple and asked the applicant to consider reducing the size of its proposed units. Ms. Fraitag disagreed with Mr. Golden, stating that, in her opinion, residents would prefer a larger house, but stated that the applicant should consider various units sizes. Mr. Desai opined that the applicant did a thorough job with its preferred layout and various alternatives.

Mr. Schwartz requested that the applicant provide the approximate price ranges of the units proposed in the applicant's preferred, 175-unit layout. Mr. Snaggs asked if there are other 55+ communities in the area, similar to the applicant's proposal. Mr. Mahalek responded that there are none that he is aware of in the immediate vicinity of this site, but that there are examples from Long Island citied in the DEIS.

Mr. Schmidt stated that the list of substantive questions would be amended to include the adjustments and additions discussed tonight, and that he would distribute the revised document to the Planning Board for final review, prior to transmission to the Town Board.

On a motion made by Mr. Schwartz and seconded by Mr. Golden, the Planning Board unanimously voted to issue its list of substantive questions on the applicant's DEIS, as amended, to the Town Board.

7. **NEW BUSINESS (continued)**

a. **Case No. PB 20-27** Dalewood II Shopping Center, *377 Central Park Avenue North (P.O. Hartsdale, N.Y.) – Special Permit (Restaurant) and Planning Board Shared Parking Reduction*
A work session to discuss a Planning Board special permit application and Planning Board shared parking reduction request involving the proposed conversion of a 2,000 sq. ft. vacant retail building into restaurant space. The applicant is proposing the conversion of an existing 2,000 sq. ft. vacant retail space into a restaurant space, to facilitate a bakery-style restaurant. The restaurant is proposed to have approximately 30 seats and requires an additional 17 off-street parking spaces. The site previously was granted a shared parking reduction of 79 spaces, from 522 spaces (required) to 443 spaces (approved), under Case PB 16-34. The applicant is requesting a shared parking reduction to account for the 17 additional off-street parking spaces required in connection with the proposed conversion of already built-out space (460 spaces required – 443 spaces proposed). No existing parking spaces will be removed in connection with the proposal. The property consists of approximately 372,489 sq. ft. (8.55 acres) and is situated on the western side of Central Park Avenue North (NYS Route 100) approximately 1080 ft. from the intersection of Fieldstone Drive. The property is located in the CA Central Avenue Mixed-Use Impact District and is designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 8.150-96-4. A portion of the property (approximately 24,800 sq. ft. or .57 acres) is located in the City of White Plains.

Mr. Marc Newman, Vice President of Brixmor Property Group, representing the applicant, provided a background for the project, stating that the applicant had gained prior approval to construct a 5,000 sq. ft. outparcel building, split into 3,000 sq. ft. of restaurant space and 2,000 sq. ft. of retail space. He stated that the applicant has been unable to lease the retail space, and now would like to change that space from retail to restaurant, as interest has been received in leasing such space as a restaurant use, which would require a parking reduction of 17 spaces from the Planning Board, as well as a special permit for the change in use to restaurant. Mr. Newman noted that both the parking study provided by the applicant, and the memorandum from Mr. John Canning, PE, of Kimley Horn, the Town's traffic consultant for this project, concluded that there is more than adequate off-site parking available on the site to accommodate the change in use. Mr. Charles Utschig, P.E., of Langan Engineering, representing the applicant, stated that there would be an estimated 80 excess spaces with a restaurant use, with approximately 40 of those spaces being behind the main shopping center building.

Chairperson Simon asked Mr. Schmidt to elaborate on the memorandum issued by Mr. Canning. Mr. Schmidt stated that Mr. Canning concluded that there is more than enough parking available on the site for the proposed restaurant use, and that the one comment Mr. Canning had was for the Board to consider if the applicant should provide some employee parking in the rear of the shopping center, where a large portion of the generally available on-site parking is situated.

Chairperson Simon asked if the application addressed the special permit requirements. Mr. Schmidt responded that the applicant provided a list of how the proposal meets the special permit criteria, and noted that there was a question as to whether there existed adequate waste capacity, which was confirmed in the applicant's submittal. Mr. Newman confirmed that adequate waste capacity exists for the types of restaurants the applicant currently is in talks with, though additional capacity may be required if a different restaurant were to sign a lease for this space.

Mr. Schmidt advised that the anticipated peak parking demands of the two restaurants (one existing, one proposed) in the same building are projected to be at different times. Mr. Newman clarified that no lease had been signed yet for the 2,000 sq. ft. space, which is the subject of this application, though he agreed that the peak demand times would complement each other, based on the interest the center has received to date.

Mr. Schmidt asked if there would be any objection on behalf of the shopping center to designating some of the rear parking as employee only. Mr. Newman responded that the applicant would be able to accommodate this. Mr. Golden stated that the requirement could be provided for in the lease with the restaurant. Mr. Schwartz opined that it was premature to place a restriction on the site, suggesting that the parking situation be revisited in one year, as has been done with other projects. Mr. Golden suggested putting the restriction in the lease but not enforcing it unless needed. Chairperson Simon stated that the Planning Board would make a decision on how to address employee parking after conducting a public hearing and further discussing the matter.

Mr. Desai asked if plans of the interior of the restaurant were available. Mr. Schmidt replied that, usually, they are, though not in this case, since there is not a set tenant. Mr. Schmidt noted that a floor plan must be accepted by the Building Inspector and Fire Marshal before a building permit can be issued. Mr. Newman added that the shared parking reduction request limits the number of seats a restaurant could have to no more than 30.

Chairperson Simon stated that this matter would be heard at a public hearing of the Planning Board on February 3, 2021. Mr. Schmidt requested that the applicant provide a response to the memorandum issued by Mr. Canning by January 27, 2020. Mr. Utschig confirmed that a response would be provided within this timeframe.

8. ESTABLISH DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Greenburgh Planning Board will be held on Wednesday, February 3, 2021, and will begin at 5:00 pm via Zoom-enabled Video Conference.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The January 20, 2021 work session of the Town of Greenburgh Planning Board was adjourned at 7:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Schmidt
Deputy Commissioner,
Department of Community Development and Conservation