

**TOWN OF GREENBURGH
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
TOWN HALL – GREENBURGH – NEW YORK
Wednesday – September 5, 2018**



The Work Session of the Planning Board of the Town of Greenburgh was held on Wednesday, September 5, 2018, in the auditorium of the Greenburgh Town Hall, 177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh, New York, and began at 8:00 pm.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairperson Walter Simon, Hugh Schwartz, Kirit Desai, Michael Golden, and Thomas Hay (Alternate – Voting Member)

Absent: Mohamed Ayoub, Chet Watson, and Viola Taliaferrow

Staff: Aaron Schmidt, Deputy Commissioner, CD&C
David Fried, Esq., 1st Deputy Town Attorney

Chairperson Simon noted that alternate Planning Board member Mr. Thomas Hay was present for this meeting, and would be a voting member in place of Mr. Mohamed Ayoub.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. August 1, 2018 Work Session Minutes

Chairperson Simon asked Planning Board members if there were any comments to the draft Planning Board minutes of August 1, 2018. Chairperson Simon requested a language modification to page four (4), paragraph four (4). On a motion made by Mr. Desai, and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board voted to approve the August 1, 2018 minutes, as amended.

3. CORRESPONDENCE

a. Public Hearing Signage

Mr. Schwartz asked for a status update on implementing signs for public hearings. Mr. Schmidt replied that the signs had been ordered, and then usage will begin as soon as they arrive.

b. Joint Town/Planning Board Meeting

Mr. Golden asked about the progress for scheduling a joint Town Board/Planning Board meeting. Chairperson Simon replied that he is coordinating a meeting date with the Town Board through Commissioner Duquesne, and will provide an update to the Planning Board members as soon as one is available. Mr. Golden noted that a joint Board meeting does not need to take place only on the fifth Wednesday of a given month, but may be scheduled on any evening where a majority of each Board's members are able to attend.

c. Educational/Training Opportunity

Mr. Desai noted that Professor Green, of the Pace University Law School, gave a presentation to the Historic and Landmarks Preservation Board earlier in the summer. Mr. Desai suggested that the Planning Board consider having her attend an upcoming meeting to give her presentation, which worthwhile. Mr. Golden requested that a copy of the presentation be distributed to the Planning Board. Mr. Schwartz suggested having Professor Green appear at a regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting, before the next Joint Town/Planning Board meeting.

d. Case No. PB 17-21 Wang-Liu Subdivision, 25 Roxbury Road (P.O. Scarsdale, N.Y.) – Preliminary Subdivision 1st Extension Request

Mr. Schmidt noted that the applicant has requested a six (6) month extension of its Preliminary Subdivision approval, which was set to expire on September 25, 2018. This is the first extension request by the applicant. On a motion made by Mr. Golden and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to grant a 180-day extension of the Preliminary Subdivision approval, this matter, valid through March 24, 2019.

e. Case No. PB 14-16 Landmark at Eastview, 777 Old Saw Mill River Road (P.O. Tarrytown, N.Y.) – Planning Board Steep Slope Permit & Wetland/Watercourse Permit 2nd Extension Request

Chairperson Simon noted that the applicant provided a formal letter of request on August 8, 2018 for a two (2) year extension of the Planning Board steep slope and wetland/watercourse permits. The applicant also

has requested an extension of its site plan approval through the Town Board. Chairperson Simon explained that this is the applicant's second extension request, the first was granted through October 22, 2018. He suggested the applicant's representative attend an upcoming work session, in order to update the Planning Board on the status of the project. Mr. Schmidt provided the Board members with additional details on the project, noting that the project was submitted in 2014, and was approved in 2016. He noted that site conditions remain the same as when the approvals initially were provided, and that no modifications were being proposed. Mr. Schwartz requested that the applicant attend a future work session to provide an update on the project. Mr. Schmidt identified that the applicant could be tentatively scheduled for a work session with the Planning Board on September 17, 2018, at which time the Planning Board could consider a vote on the extensions requested. Board members agreed.

4. OLD BUSINESS

a. Case No. PB 17-24 Nakamura Subdivision, 2 Maple Avenue (P.O. Hartsdale, N.Y.) – Final Subdivision & Tree Removal Permit

A work session to discuss the decision of a final subdivision application involving the proposed subdivision of one (1) existing lot to create two (2) lots, for the purpose of constructing one (1) new single-family residence, with related improvements. Proposed Lot 1 would consist of 16,335 sq. ft. and would include an existing residence, to remain. Proposed Lot 2 would consist of 12,093 sq. ft., and one new single-family residence would be constructed on this lot. The applicant proposes the removal of one (1) regulated tree from the subject property, requiring a tree removal permit from the Planning Board. The applicant has prepared a landscaping plan which calls for the planting of six (6) White Spruce trees, as replacement. On April 19, 2018, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted three (3) area variances, and denied one (1) area variance, in connection with the project (ZBA Case No. 17-34). The property consists of approximately 28,428 sq. ft. and is situated on the east side of Maple Avenue, at the intersection of Hillcrest Road and Maple Avenue. The property is located partially in the R-7.5 One-Family Residence District, and partially in the R-10 One-Family Residence District, and is designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 8.250-187-9.

Chairperson Simon stated that a draft decision had been circulated to the Board, noting that the only difference between the Preliminary approval and the Final approval is the inclusion of conditions related to the tree removal permit, which is tied to the Final Subdivision approval letter. Mr. Hay asked if the swimming pool, proposed to be demolished/filled in, needs to be filled in before the filing of the subdivision plat. Mr. Schmidt stated that he would get clarification on whether the pool should be filled in before the plat is filed. Board members questioned whether they could vote on the draft decision pending a determination on the required timing for filling in of the existing pool. Mr. Fried advised that the Planning Board could move forward and vote on the decision to approve the subdivision.

On a motion made by Mr. Simon and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to waive the public hearing on the final subdivision application. On a motion made by Mr. Golden and seconded by Mr. Hay, the Planning Board unanimously voted to adopt the final subdivision approval for the above referenced property, as amended, subject to the modifications and requirements listed within the decision, and further conditioned upon the existing pool being filled in or demolished, after which the Secretary to the Planning Board shall sign the subdivision plat and the approval shall take effect. On a motion made by Mr. Golden and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to grant the tree removal permit in connection with the project.

b. Case No. PB 16-25 Teverbaugh Subdivision, Woodlands Avenue North (P.O. White Plains, N.Y.) – Preliminary Subdivision, Planning Board Steep Slope Permit & Tree Removal Permit (3rd Pre-Submission Conference

A subsequent pre-submission conference (October 5, 2016 & January 4, 2017) to discuss a preliminary subdivision, Planning Board steep slope permit, and tree removal permit application involving the proposed resubdivision of five (5) existing tax lots for the purpose of creating three (3) buildable lots and constructing three (3) new one-family residences. Proposed Lot 1 would consist of approximately 10,452 sq. ft., proposed Lot 2 would consist of approximately 10,792 sq. ft., and proposed Lot 3 would consist of approximate 20,208 sq. ft. The applicant has provided three (3) alternative layouts for review and discussion. Regulated steep slope disturbances and regulated tree removals are associated with each of the three (3) layout options. The properties consist of approximately 41,452 sq. ft., are situated along an undeveloped paper street known as Van Cott Avenue, and are located approximately 100 feet south of Windom Street. The property is located

in the R-10 One-Family Residence District, and is designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 7.520-316-11, 12, 13, 14 & 15.

Chairperson Simon issued a statement regarding the procedures to be employed in reviewing the applicant's three (3) alternatives provided in connection with the proposed project, asking Members to address the positive and negative aspects of each of the design options, while refraining from making a recommendation on any one specific option. Mr. Fried advised that there are issues involving a paper street (Van Cott Avenue) associated with the proposal, which neighbors to the subject site have expressed concerns about, and counseled the Planning Board against recommending any one particular design option. Mr. Fried noted that there were mixed views from the Planning Board on previously submitted design options, and explained that the Planning Board members present at this meeting may not be the members who would be present to vote on any formal application submitted. Mr. Schwartz noted that the duty of the Planning Board is to give its opinion on projects, and that, while the Planning Board does not recommend a specific plan over another, it will issue comments on each layout presented. Mr. Golden agreed with Mr. Schwartz, stating that the Planning Board should make comments on each of the three (3) options presented. Mr. Fried confirmed that the issuance of comments related to each of the layout options would be appropriate.

Mr. Golden asked if Van Cott Avenue would be paved in each of the three (3) design options. Mr. Senor confirmed that it would. Board members discussed the paper street (Van Cott Avenue). Mr. Fried stated that a paper street is generally set within a fifty (50) foot right-of-way. In one of the layout options the proposed roadway would be twenty-six (26) feet in width and would extend over the mid-point of the right-of-way. He explained that there is a neighboring property owner on the opposite side of the right-of-way, who has voiced concerns over the proposed project and which has indicated that it may not consent to development on its side of the right-of-way.

Mr. Eliot Senor, P.E., engineer for the applicant, presented the three (3) layout options associated with a potential application, noting that area variances appear to be required in each scenario. Mr. Senor identified Option 1 as proposing a shared driveway coming off of Woodlands Avenue for access to proposed Lots 1 & 2, and a twenty (20) foot wide private roadway/driveway (Van Cott Avenue) coming off of Windom Street to service proposed Lot 3. The private roadway extension would contain a hammerhead shaped turn-around that meets NYS Fire Code. Mr. Senor stated this design was not preferred because there would be additional disturbances to regulated steep slopes, additional tree removals, and additional site work in the vicinity of neighboring residences, resulting from the construction of the shared driveway. Mr. Senor added that Option 1 would provide fire access for all three (3) homes. Mr. Senor identified Option 1 as his least preferred option.

Mr. Senor explained that Option 2 proposes the construction of a twenty-six (26) foot wide roadway (Van Cott Avenue) coming off of Windom Street to access all three (3) lots. The roadway for this option would cross over the center line of the Van Cott Avenue right-of-way and would be constructed to Town standards. Proposed Lot 3 would include a hammerhead style driveway for emergency access and turn-around. He explained that this option would result in less total disturbance than option 1.

Mr. Senor explained that Option 3 proposes the construction of a twenty (20) foot wide private roadway to service all three (3) lots. The entire roadway would be set within the twenty-five (25) foot section of the fifty (50) foot right-of-way for the paper street (Van Cott Avenue) adjacent to the applicant's properties. Proposed Lot 3 would include a hammerhead style driveway for emergency access and turn-around. He explained that the applicant is agreeable to no on-street parking, due to the narrowness of the proposed roadway. He stated that an HOA would be established for snow clearing and maintenance of the roadway. He indicated that the Fire Department has requested additional fire hydrants for this option. Mr. Senor noted that this is his preferred option as it would lessen overall disturbance and tree removal. Mr. Senor opined that Option 3 also respects the neighbor's concerns. Mr. Senor stated that an area for snow storage could be created at the northerly side of Van Cott Avenue. Mr. Senor noted that a cut back, at the Windom Street end of Van Cott Avenue, would be created which would only extend as far as the right-of-way for Windom Street, where snow could be stored.

Mr. Golden noted that he lives on a sixteen (16) foot wide road within the Town of Greenburgh which services nine (9) homes, he opined that a twenty (20) foot roadway, with three (3) homes, appears to be workable. Mr. Schwartz asked why the proposed roadway in Option 3 was not set directly to the center line of the 50-foot right-of-way. Mr. Senor stated that there would be grading requirements and a one (1) to four

(4) foot high retaining wall necessary in that area. He added that the neighbor to the southeast, who had expressed concerns regarding the project, would not have access to the proposed roadway. Mr. Golden suggested the applicant contact the neighbors to see if they would be willing to agree to a Town Standard roadway that the neighbor could have access too. Mr. Fried noted that Town Staff would reach out to the neighbor's representative to notify him about this Planning Board meeting, so that he could review the video and/or the minutes. Mr. Golden stated that the Planning Board should invite the neighbor and his representation to future work sessions and public hearings, after a formal submission is made.

Mr. Desai noting that the option 2 would result in a Town standard roadway, may be the most appropriate option, although he expressed his concern that this option may not be viable, based on the concerns of the neighboring property owner. Mr. Schwartz asked if the neighbor's permission to build out the roadway within portions of the entire 50-foot right-of-way, is required. Mr. Fried advised that he would not opine on the rights of the two (2) private property owners. He added that Town Staff had recommended the applicant start a dialogue with the neighbor, to which it did. Mr. Fried noted that there may or may not be an agreement between the two (2) parties, at some future point. Mr. Senor stated that the rights to the paper street are unsettled law, and at this point, there is no status on how that law should be interpreted.

Mr. Schwartz noted that Option 1 would result in greater overall disturbance, and Option 2 and Option 3 would appear to hinge on the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). He opined that Option 2 and 3 were better plans than Option 1. Mr. Golden opined that Option 3 was the most favorable. Mr. Hay agreed that option 1 would result in additional disturbances and is therefore not preferable. He stated that he would need more information on the implications of a twenty (20) foot and a twenty-six (26) foot roadway before he could provide his opinion. He noted that he understands the neighbors concerns over losing open space.

Mr. Senor explained that a twenty-six (26) foot roadway would be constructed as a Town Standard roadway, and could be dedicated to the Town. He added that on-street parking availability and functionality would be different in each of the two types of roadways presented this evening. Mr. Senor noted that stormwater runoff would be reduced with a twenty (20) foot roadway... Mr. Hay responded that the Option 3 may be the best option, if the twenty (20) foot roadway is reasonable. Chairperson Simon opined that Option 2 may be the best of the three (3) options, but Option 3 may be the most viable. He added that Option 1 was the least preferable, but could still be a viable option. Mr. Desai expressed his opinion that a Town standard road should be built as this would solve fire access, parking, snow removal, and other issues. Mr. Golden noted that a Town standard roadway would be beneficial, as the Town could take it over for services. Mr. Schmidt noted that even if the roadway were to be built to Town standards, it does not guarantee that the Town would take it over, particularly if the stormwater management system is situated underneath the roadbed. Mr. Golden opined that Option 3 is preferable in that it would result in less overall impervious surface coverage.. Mr. Senor thanked the Board for its comments.

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. **Case No. PB 18-01** New Castle Building Products, 535 Old Tarrytown Road (P.O. White Plains, N.Y.) – Amended Site Plan, Planning Board Steep Slope Permit & Tree Removal Permit (Town Forestry Officer Approval)

A work session to discuss an amended site plan and Planning Board steep slope permit application involving a proposal to construct forty-eight (48) new off-street parking spaces at the subject property, with related improvements. The project involves the proposed construction of an approximately 523-foot long retaining wall ranging from 9' to 23' in height, the proposed removal of 50 regulated trees, and the inclusion of a stormwater management system. The applicant proposes 2,786 sq. ft. of disturbance on 15-25% slopes (STEEP SLOPES), 1,260 sq. ft. of disturbance on 25-35% slopes (VERY STEEP SLOPES) and 12,728 sq. ft. of disturbance on 35%+ slopes (EXCESSIVELY STEEP SLOPES). The project requires approximately 0 cubic yards of cut and 1700 cubic yards of imported fill, requiring a fill permit from the Town Engineer. Area variances are required from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The property consists of approximately 191,231 sq. ft. (4.39 acres) and is situated on the southerly side of Old Tarrytown Road approximately 550 feet from the intersection of Knollwood Road. The property is situated in the LI – Light Industrial Zoning District and is designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 7.410-221-15.

Chairperson Simon stated he is pleased that the applicant is pursuing an expansion of its site and will be maintaining its headquarters in the Town of Greenburgh. Mr. Eric Hanninen, P.E., project engineer, presented an overview of the project, noting changes made to the project details based on interactions with Town Staff.

He explained that the length of the retaining wall was revised to reduce impervious surface coverage, tree removal, construction costs, and fill, while still achieving the applicant's goals for additional on-site parking to accommodate the growth of the business and to house its headquarters at this location. Mr. Hanninen described proposed stormwater mitigation efforts for the project, noting the inclusion of an underground stormwater management system. Mr. Golden asked for additional detail on the stormwater system. Mr. Hanninen explained that the stormwater system piping was designed to handle a ten (10) year storm (outlet only), while the underground storage system was designed to handle a one-hundred (100) year storm (capture and hold). Mr. Hay asked if there were enough catch basins proposed within the area. Mr. Hanninen confirmed that there were, and explained that one (1) catch basin can cover an approximate area of one (1) acre, noting that there are four (4) catch basins proposed at the low points of the parking area.

Mr. Golden requested that a site visit be scheduled, noting the growth of the business impressed him. Mr. Schmidt advised that he would coordinate small group site visits with interested Board members, and the applicant's representative. Mr. Desai asked for an explanation of the required area variances associated with the project. Mr. Haninnen explained the three (3) proposed area variances: (1) Off-street parking setback to principal building (required 25 ft., proposed 0 ft.); (2) Off-street parking setback to side lot line (required 25 ft., proposed 11.2 ft.); and, (3) Impervious surface coverage (permitted 80%, proposed 82.4%), and reviewed existing and proposed customer and employee parking areas. Mr. Schmidt noted that the applicant also would be requesting a waiver from the Planning Board, in connection with a requirement that landscaped curbed islands be provided every fifteen (15) parking spaces as allowed in Section 285-38D(8) of the Zoning Ordinance. He added that a coordinated review with the Zoning Board of Appeals, and other interested agencies, should be conducted under SEQRA, and that the Planning Board may wish to discuss whether it would prefer to be the Lead Agency.

Mr. Desai asked if the project meets the Town's off-street parking requirements. Mr. Schmidt responded that, with the addition of the proposed parking, the site would meet Town parking requirements. Chairperson Simon asked if pervious pavers could be utilized anywhere on the site. Mr. Haninnen explained that the incorporation of pervious pavers in the area of proposed work could negatively impact the proposed retaining wall. He added that there are other areas on the property where pervious pavers could work, but those areas are not proposed to be disturbed. Chairperson Simon asked for the net reduction in stormwater runoff figures. Mr. Haninnen identified that those figures were provided in the Preliminary Stormwater Report, which was submitted to the Planning Board. Mr. Haninnen explained the runoff figures, noting that the project would result in a sizeable reduction in stormwater leaving the site, when compared to current conditions.

Chairperson Simon asked for additional information concerning the proposed retaining wall. Mr. Haninnen stated that soil borings were conducted, and explained the construction of the retaining wall, noting the addition of geo-grid fabric and the use of a segmented block wall. Mr. Haninnen identified fifty (50) trees to be removed from the site. Mr. Schmidt noted that, since there are limited on-site areas for replacement of trees, he has identified off-site, Town owned areas available for replacement tree plantings, to which the applicant was agreeable to provide, at the request of Town staff and the Planning Board.

Mr. Golden asked if sidewalks could be provided along Old Tarrytown Road. Chairperson Simon expressed his support for a sidewalk along the applicant's frontage with Old Tarrytown Road. Mr. Keith Haskell, COO of New Castle Building Products, noted that there may be some areas along the frontage of the property that are too narrow for a sidewalk, but acknowledged that the applicant is willing to work with Town staff and the Planning Board on the construction of a sidewalk.

Mr. Fried identified that the fencing along the frontage of the property has areas that are in poor condition. Mr. Haskell stated that the applicant would be willing to repair or replace the fence as necessary. Chairperson Simon noted a safety issue regarding trucks associated with this use being staged resulting in unsafe conditions along Old Tarrytown Road, and asked the applicant its plans to resolve this issue. Mr. Haskell acknowledged that the staging of trucks along Old Tarrytown Road has been a concern of the applicant as well, and advised that New Castle Building Products actively was working to ameliorate this issue. He advised that if this project is approved, it would relieve congestion within the front yard portion of the property, and better allow truck access into the site, lessening any truck staging along Old Tarrytown Road.

On a motion made by Mr. Golden and seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Planning Board unanimously voted to declare its intent to serve as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQRA review. Mr. Schmidt stated that he would circulate the Board's intent to involved and interested agencies.

- b. **Case No. TB 18-17/PB 18-18** Westchester Hills Cemetery, 400 Saw Mill River Road (P.O. Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y.) – Amended Site Plan (Town Board Approval – Referrral to Planning Board), Planning Board Steep Slope Permit & Tree Removal Permit (Town Forestry Officer Approval)

A work session to discuss an amended site plan (Town Board approval – referral to Planning Board) and Planning Board steep slope permit application for a proposal involving the full interior renovation of an existing on-site administration building, with related improvements. The project also involves the construction of a small addition to the existing administration building, in order to provide a service area and additional crypts. An existing shed is proposed to be removed. The applicant proposes 1,430 sq. ft. of disturbance on 15-25% slopes (STEEP SLOPES), 161 sq. ft. of disturbance on 25-35% slopes (VERY STEEP SLOPES), and 128 sq. ft. of disturbance on 35%+ slopes (EXCESSIVELY STEEP SLOPES). The project requires approximately 60 cubic yards of excavation and 0 cubic yards of imported fill. The applicant proposes the removal of two (2) regulated trees requiring a tree removal permit from the Town Forestry Officer. The applicant has prepared a landscaping plan which calls for the planting of various shrubs, flowers, and groundcover. The project also involves the removal of curbing, walkways, and other minor improvements, in the area of proposed work. Area variances are required from the Zoning Board of Appeals in connection with the proposal. The property consists of approximately 638,464 sq. ft. (14.66 acres) and is situated on the easterly side of Saw Mill River Road approximately 2,500 feet from the intersection of Saw Mill River Road and Jackson Avenue. The property is situated in the R-30 One-Family Residence Zoning District, and is designated on the tax map of the Town of Greenburgh as Parcel ID: 8.490-349-2 & 3.

Mr. Chris Tramutola, R.A., architect for the applicant, presented an overview of the project, noting the history of the existing building and its various uses over its history. Mr. Tramutola explained that the applicant is proposing to renovate the second floor chapel space and construct additional first floor administration space. He added that a small addition, which was built in the 1960's, is proposed to be demolished. Mr. Schmidt identified that a Planning Board steep slope permit, and area variances through the Zoning Board of Appeals, are required in addition to the amended site plan from the Town Board.. Mr. Tramutola explained that the cemetery was built before the current Town code requirements for cemeteries in the Town of Greenburgh were created, and so, the applicant does not meet a number of requirements within the Town. Mr. Tramutola explained that the roof on the existing one-story portion of the building would be replaced. He added that the stone portion of the existing building is proposed to be removed and repurposed. He advised that, as part of the project, ADA access is proposed to be provided. Mr. Tramutola stated that seventy-five (75) to eighty (80) new crypts are proposed to be built into the landscape around the existing building. Mr. Fried asked how many more plots are available, and when is the cemetery expected to reach capacity. Mr. Tramutola explained that the cemetery has approximately three thousand (3,000) vacant plots available, with capacity expected to be reached in approximately fifteen (15) to twenty-five (25) years. Mr. Fried asked what the applicant's plan is for once capacity is reached. Mr. Tramutola stated that the applicant has certain investments that will allow the cemetery to provide upkeep and tax funds for the future. He added that the intention of the renovations are to create a timeless building that will last another hundred years or so.

Chairperson Simon asked about proposed stormwater management. Mr. Tramutola noted that the project would increase impervious surfaces on the site. He added that there is currently no stormwater drainage system for the building, however, the applicant is proposing a new system to capture runoff from the building and direct it towards six (6) storm receptors. Mr. Schwartz asked about parking on-site. Mr. Tramutola explained traffic patterns for the site, noting the applicant is proposing a new drop-off point adjacent to the main access to the building, and that parking is located along the internal roadways of the cemetery. Mr. Schmidt noted that no variance for parking was identified by the Building Department in its review memorandum, and stated that he would check on this issue. Mr. Hay identified some inconsistencies with the application materials. Mr. Schmidt stated that Town Staff would coordinate with the applicant to revise application materials appropriately. Mr. Desai questioned the proposed change to the character of the existing roofline of the 1-story portion of the building, and the faux chimney expansion shown on the plans. Mr. Schmidt noted that a recommendation to the Town Board could be discussed by the Planning Board. Chairperson Simon suggested that staff draft a recommendation to the Town Board for review by the Planning Board at its next meeting. Mr. Schwartz suggested drafting a positive recommendation to the Town Board to be voted on at the September 17, 2018 meeting. Mr. Schwartz asked about review by the Historic and

Landmarks Preservation Board. Mr. Schmidt explained the review process associated with the Historic and Landmarks Preservation Board (H&LPB), and noted that H&LPB members would be conducting a site visit prior to the next Planning Board meeting

6. **ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING & PUBLIC DISCUSSION (ITEMS WILL START NO SOONER THAN 8:45 P.M.)**

There were no public hearings held as part of this meeting.

7. **ESTABLISH DATE FOR NEXT MEETING**

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Greenburgh Planning Board will be held on Monday, September 17, 2018 and will begin at 8:00 pm in the Greenburgh Town Hall Auditorium.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

The September 5, 2018 work session of the Town of Greenburgh Planning Board was adjourned at 11:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Aaron Schmidt
Deputy Commissioner,
Department of Community Development and Conservation