



**City Planning Board**  
**Department of Planning & Community Development**  
City Hall - Roosevelt Square  
Mount Vernon, New York 10550-2060  
(914) 699-7230 • FAX (914) 699-1435

Ernest D. Davis  
Mayor

William Holmes  
Chair

**MINUTES**  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
**PUBLIC HEARING**

A special meeting of the City Planning Board will be held on, **Wednesday September 4, 2013 at 6:30 p.m.** in the City Council Chambers, Second Floor, City Hall, Mount Vernon, New York at which time and place the Board shall consider the following:

**Roll Call**

**William Holmes**  
**Marcus Griffith**  
**Michael Justino**  
**Janet Snyder**  
**Sophia Trott**  
**Darryl Selsey**  
**Lesly Zamor**

**ITEM # 1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**1.1** Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on Wednesday July 10, 2013.

Motion to approve: Board Member Justino, Board Member Trott second, all in favor one abstention. The "I" has it. Motion carries.

**1.2** Approval of the minutes of the special meeting held on Monday June 17, 2013.

Motion to approve: Board Member Trott, Board Member Justino second, all in favor one abstention. The "I" has it. Motion carries.

**1.3** Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on Wednesday May 1, 2013.

Motion to approve: Board Member Trott, Board Member Griffith second, all in favor two abstentions. The motion doesn't pass.

**1.4** Approval of the minutes of the special meeting held on Thursday August 15, 2013.

Motion to table.

## ITEM # 2 DELIBERATIONS

### 2.1 Case No. 05-2013: 47 Grove Street (Section 164.76, Block 1065, Lots 23 & 26).

The application of Errol McIntosh on behalf of Natalina Holding Corp is seeking site plan review for existing property in order to increase the convenience of existing outdoor storage space.

**SEQRA Determination:** This action is an uncoordinated review and classified as an "Unlisted Action". The Planning Board issued a negative declaration with regard to this application requiring no further SEQRA assessment.

Staff: Mr. Chair, just before you move forward, you've received two letters from the public which have been disturbed to the Board Members.

Chairman Holmes: I'll ask that Staff include those in the records. Thank you. Board Members: we're in deliberations on this application. Any discussions, commits, shall we take it to a vote?

Board Member Justino: I'll make a commit; I won't make a motion at this point. But as we have discussed and deliberated, my personal feelings are based on the issues that we had for the owner of this property that those items were basically satisfactory: so my feeling is that we should, if not in it's present form make a motion. I know there are one or two concerns about the wood burning stove and if somebody wants to address that in a motion I would be willing to consider that.

Board Member Snyder: I'm not sure how we should handle the wood burning stove issue, because I don't know if we have purview over that: that doesn't seem to be a site issue.

Board Member Selsey: We have purview over whether there's an odor that emanates from the wood burning stove: that it could be a concern if it goes into the environment and the neighborhoods would be causing an issue.

Board Member Snyder: Is that something that the Building Dept. should check and enforce or do we have to put a requirement into our motions to make sure that there are no obnoxious fumes?

Chairman Holmes: What I had asked Staff to research as far as in the code books or were there any guidance the Board could take. One of the provisions discusses or one of the aspects was to consider: with regards to site plan approval and the protection of environmental quality and the preservation and the enhancement of property values in neighboring areas. So that is one aspect that the Board has purview over: if that answers your question Commissioner?

Board Member Snyder: Do you have a recommendation Darryl?

Board Member Selsey: My recommendation would be to find out whether the applicant would possibility address the concerns that are there, maybe a friendlier type of heating source in terms of the fumes. I mean that seems to be something that a few of the neighbors has concerns, so seeing whether or not that is a necessary or not. I think that we should move forward but I guess that's a concern that should be addressed.

Chairman Holmes: Does any member of the Board have any other commits or Board member wishes to put forth a motion or we could put forth a motion to table till such time.

Board Member Justino: My recommendation is that we don't table this, that we do make a decision. Like I said earlier: I'm prepared to make a motion, but based on commits of a few more of the Board members: there is a concern about the odor and smoke that's coming from the wood burning stove. It's something that I have difficulty putting into motion, and I would hope that, since Darryl has articulated better than I have if you would make a motion which included something that would guard against soiling of the air and smoke and odorless discharge from the wood burning stove then I'm prepared to except a motion like that.

Chairman Holmes: So as I understand Commissioner. You're putting forth a motion in which direction.

Board Member Selsey: I would like to make a motion that the wood burning stoves would be subject to any permits and any other ordinances that would be applicable. I'm voting to move forward with an approval, based on that.

Board Member Griffith: I have another suggestion, being that a lot of the neighbors complained about fumes: it may be a good idea to have the applicant post a sign that requires the trucks not to idle their trucks and also to give the trucks that are picking up: directions on how to enter and exit. That was something that was submitted to us in a letter to all of their vendors. But it may be a good idea to have a sign directed on the property, letting repeated customers know the applicants requested way of entering and exiting the property, as well as there will be no idling.

Chairman Holmes: So what I'm hearing Commissioners is: A motion by Commissioner Selsey to approve the application with the following condition and the condition being that the applicant address the issues of pollution... and any permits and any other ordinances that would be applicable. Do I have a second on that?

Board Member Snyder: I would like second that but I would like to also include Commissioner Griffith's condition that the applicant corrects the sign directing the traffic and trucks as to their required entrance and exit from the establishment and not to idle their trucks.

Board Member Griffith: Second

Chairman Holmes: What I will offer to the additional amend to that are the following conditions; to ask the applicant to assure that they are preventing any dust, erosion, or drainage damages into any adjacent properties, both during and after construction. To the planting of

ground cover installation of any appropriate protective devices on or above the surface to prevent the odor gases from admitting other neighbors. Is the Board amendable to that additional condition?

Board Member Trott: I second that additional amendment as a very robust enforcement.

Chairman Holmes: I'll ask all those in favor say I. Six ayes; one abstention (Commissioner Trott). Motion carries.

### ITEM # 3 PUBLIC HEARING

**3.1 Case #6-2013** 260 South Third Avenue (Section 169.23, Block 3106, Lot 16) located within the CB (Commercial Business) Zoning District.

The application of Arthur Kahane on behalf of Michael Sherry is seeking site plan review and a special use permit to convert an existing printing plant into a wholesale business which includes warehouse and distribution.

**SEQRA Determination:** This action is an uncoordinated review and classified as an "Unlisted Action"; wherein, the Planning Board must render a SEQRA assessment prior to deliberating on this matter.

Judson Siebert: Attorney for a law firm of Keane & BeanePC: representing applicant the owners. There are several joint owners for the property 260 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The application in front of the Board is relatively a straight forward one. We are talking about a portion of the premises on South 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The premises is somewhat a flag shaped property along 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There are three building on the premises and an outdoor parking area. One of the buildings is being supported by loading and parking area front South 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The application before the Board involves the middle building and the building on the end. The building shaded in pink is a three story building it's supported by loading facilities along the portion of South 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The second and third stories are committed to office space. The intention is to keep them in that condition. We're also talking about the third building, which is a 19,000 sq foot single story open building. This building is also surrounded by an open parking area. The proposal is to utilize the two building in conjunction with one another for a single tenant. The tenant is a company call World Pac. They are an importer and distributor of auto mobile parts. The type of business under the code is wholesale business. It's centrally a distribution center, a weigh station for World Pac in terms of serving a region in lower New York State and Connecticut for distribution of parts from a facility in New Jersey: stored here and then distributed off premises to customers. The location that World Pac currently uses for this region is in Stamford, it would be moved to this location in Mt. Vernon. There are no exterior alterations to the premises proposed but one exception, and that is here on the middle building: that would be a construction of a handicap ramp to provide for access into the office space. The one thing that would occur from result of the installation of this ramp is that one existing parking space, which is parallel to the building front, would be eliminated. The only non-conformance on the site at present is the excess in terms of the impervious service is about a 6% deviation, but that's an

existing condition. We're not changing or expanding that in any way. The interior alterations of the building are for purposes of storing of parts that World Pac will bring in. There's no structural change to the building, actually we're using a metal bracket system. With regards to the parts with this facility are transportable. We're talking about belts, hoses: we're not talking about seats or car panels. No large auto parts only smaller auto components. The manner in which they would be delivered to the site, as mentioned, there's an East Coast distribution facility located in South Brunswick, NJ. There will be one tractor trailer or box truck delivery per day to this facility that would be conducted on a five day a week bases. The Facility will be opened, Monday - Friday from 6:15AM - 5PM. A half day on the weekends 6:30am - noon. The tractor trailer will utilize the existing loading facility: once the parts are delivered to this facility by the tractor trailer or box truck, the deliveries will then be moved off-site during the day by the World Pac fleet. The fleets they utilize are pick-up trucks or Toyota Prius. They're transporting small parts. They would be moving in and out about two to three times a day. There will also be a customer service pick-up window.

Chairman Holmes: Questions from the Board?

Board Member Zamor: You represent the landlord, I believe.

Judson Siebert: The landlord and the owner.

Board Member Zamor: Is the landlord familiar with the Urban Renewal proposals going on in this area?

Judson Siebert: We're aware of the fact that there have been certain studies done in this area. We feel that this particular property at present: it's there, it's ours to use and it's something that should be put to productive use.

Board Member Zamor: I would just recommend that you check with Staff and look further into what's going to be proposed in the area. To help you make a more wise discussion with this property. But the use of it as you propose right now seems to be very viable.

Board Member Justino: I have a question about the auto's part company. They're signing a lease with the owner of the property?

Judson Siebert: World Pac will be signing a seven year lease with the owner.

Board Member Snyder: In my option, I think this a very compatible use to what was there prior and I'm glad to see that someone wants to re-locate from Stamford to Mt. Vernon.

Board Member Justino: Tell us about the outgoing delivery trucks.

Judson Siebert: They utilize two types of vehicles: Toyota Tacoma and Toyota Prius.

Board Member Justino: The amount of trips.

Judson Siebert: They have projected two to three trips off premises during the work day. There could be more, depending on the business that day. Not the tractor trailers or box vans only the smaller vehicles.

Board Member Justino: It just seems like a small vehicle. I don't know how many you can put in this large warehouse. You say three trips. I'm not sure it's realist I just want to be sure this is what you're saying.

Chairman Holmes: Tell us about the service area.

Judson Siebert: The service area is currently serviced by a facility out of Stamford. There are also similar facilities in the New York metropolitan area in Queens and Long Island. We're not talking about the City. We're talking about the lower Hudson Valley, Westchester and Southern Connecticut.

Chairman Holmes: The hours are 6:15AM - 5:00 PM. What are the hours for your pick-up window? No late hours.

Judson Siebert: I would assume they would be 9-5. As long as there are people on the site, and servicing the people in the trade, I guess the pick up window will be the hours of the operation.

Chairman Holmes: How many numbers of employees? Can you identify the employee parking: on the premises or on the street.

Judson Siebert: 12 to 15 initially: with a potential to grow up to 20. The employee will be utilizing the lot that L's around the building. This area will also be open for use of the loading facilities, for Will call window parking. You're talking approximately 50 parking spaces in this area.

Chairman Holmes: Will the employees have an option to park there or will they be directed to park there.

Judson Siebert: One of the conditions of being lease to World Pac, I believe was looking for a commitment on employee parking. I can certainly speak to them, but if the Board would like to make a condition on the approval of the fact that employee parking be provided in this area, we would abide by that condition.

Board Member Zamor: You mentioned the green grassy spaces. Are you going to maintain it as is?

Michael Sherry: I'm located at Yonkers, NY. We have a landscaper contractor who maintains the property a couple times a month.

Chairman Holmes: Tell me a little about what you expect with deliveries per vehicle, or trips per vehicle.

Judson Siebert: The delivery into the premises will be one delivery per day in the morning and will be completed at or around 6:30AM. Then during the day, again, the projection from World Pac, are two to three on and off site trips with the smaller vehicles.

Chairman Holmes: How many vehicles are in the current facility?

Judson Siebert: This is completely new to this site.

Chairman Holmes: I thought you said they were moving from an existing facility. Do they have the current model in Stamford?

Judson Siebert: They operate in this fashion. There's no car storage on site. The vehicles will come from off site to the premises and then move off site again.

Chairman Holmes: Will these vehicles be parked on site and utilize the 50 parking spaces. How many vehicles are expecting total. The green fleet.

Judson Siebert: About six.

Board Member Justino: Please clarify. You said three trucks, now six. So there are six vehicles, two to three trips per vehicle.

Chairman Holmes: If no further questions. We will open Public hearing. Is there any correspondence from staff?

Staff Long: We have one correspondence and one objection from a residence 251 S. Fifth Avenue. The traffic will become heavier: we need more affordable housing in the area: taxes may increase for home owners. In terms from question from Staff: for clarity you said there's no non-conformity on the site. One non-conformity presently on the site is the outdoor storage for the vehicle that are parked there: as far as I know that's not permitted. Another point that needs to be clarified is the plan examiner report indicates that a special use permit is required from the Planning Board, but it states that the Zoning Board of appeals is necessary. It's not clear if the ZBA is necessary or not. Also for both uses, typically what happens is parking has to accommodate all uses on this site. Is the ample parking for your use and other operations going on? I was going thru the application, you said that they were going to park the delivery trucks on site, and as far as I know is parking delivery trucks on site is not permitted in this particular zone. So the question is: is the plan examiners report reflecting all the activities accruing on site.

Judson Siebert: The activities on site: first of all in regards to the outdoor storage. I urge the City to re inspect the property, although some of the photograph shows all of the automobiles being parked in that side lot are not there and they would not be there as part of World Pac's use of the

premises because we need to utilize that parking area for World Pac's needs. In terms in whether there is sufficient parking for all of the operations, I think the answer lies in the code and code sets forth very specific computations as to what is necessary for office and for warehouse and we more than meet it with the elimination of the one space for the handicap access. 50 spaces are required, we have 60. We have 12 to 15 employees currently, certainly we can accommodate that with the delivery vehicles can be accommodated. With regard to the parking of vehicles I have to refer to the code provision your referring to, because quite frankly, I think parking of vehicles for the commercial use, providing they're not being stored, they're simply a function to the use that is part and parcel to the use itself and finally with regards to the Zoning Board involvement in this, the code states that, this is a special use permit application to be granted by the Planning Board and the Planning Board alone, I think this is squarely in front of this Board to the extent their concern about outdoor parking or outdoor storage of automobiles that's been eliminated and we have an application that's code compliance.

Board Member Justino: The cars in the photo are no longer there. So help me understand, there was a tenant in there who was utilizing the space and that tenant is no longer in the space.

Judson Siebert: They're no longer there, because we're preparing the site for World Pac.

Boars Member Zamor: Subject upon approval, we will need the sidewalks in front of the site to be maintained and any street trees that are missing, to be returned.

Judson Siebert: We would comply with that condition.

Chairman Holmes: If no other questions, I will open public hearing. I'll ask any members of the public to speak in favor or opposing the application. The application is 260 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave.

Staff Long: The correct address is 260 S. 3<sup>Rd</sup> Avenue.

Shirley Moore: The address is 310-312 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This is a blighted area from studies that have been done city wide. This means that any projects that go in there should have some sort of vitalization of this area. Not just a development of this corporation. How does this project or this proposal of business benefit this area? How is it funded? Is there any public money going into this company, because the business is in this area? There's 1,000's of children in this neighborhood and apartment building all over the neighborhood. It's just this one block from E. 3<sup>rd</sup> St. to E. 4<sup>th</sup> St. that is commercial. The rest is residential. You have this big box truck coming in two or three times a day or six times a week will have to go thru the residential area. In the morning the children are getting on the buses, how is that going to impact the buses? How does this benefit the neighborhood? How will it improve the neighborhood? Who is going to pave the road, with all this truck traffic? Are we going to see less tax?

Curtis Brunton: 254 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Would like the Board to consider: the delivery trucks route and number of deliveries?

Kathy Brunton: 254 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Would like the Board to consider; hours of operation. Can you make sure that no thru traffic signs are posted at the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup>? Are they paying taxes?

Barbara Smeal: 242 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I'm the owner of the building. This is a residential area even though this block is commercial. There are a lot of children in this neighborhood and we are working very hard in our community to enhance the lifestyle here in Mt. Vernon. Where will they be entering and exiting: on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue or 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. My concerns are because on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue there's a child's playground.

Jenn Wiggins: 335 S 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I'm hear to speak for the neighborhood. South 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue has fake speed bumps and my concerns are for the children in the neighborhood and the traffic that will occur. Can the Board also direct them not to go down 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and pass 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 4<sup>th</sup> Street with the trucks? Also parking is an issue.

Chairman Holmes: The Board can set conditions after having a conversation with the applicant on traffic, that's within the Boards purview. Any other members of the public would like to speak for or in opposition of this application?

Sherman Gray: 223 S 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. When I first moved here, I was attracted by a sign that said: City of Homes, but over the last 30 years, it appears that it has become the City of commercial properties. I would like to recommend that this property not be allowed to operate, simple because they have not shown, to me, enough consistency to be operated properly. We don't want a pilot program. This property can't work in this area.

Evelyn Valdengray: 223 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. I'm respecting the lower Hudson Community resource center and I want to thank them for being here and coming out to voice their option. Not in favor of the applicant. Is this company world wide? If this is the case, this will increase trafficking. I've been trying to build community housing for the children in our area instead of a commercial property. If he would sell us that building, we can make it a community center for the children.

Chairman Holmes: Any other members of the public who wish to speak in favor or in opposition of this application? If not, I'll ask the attorney to please come up and address the questions that you can answer.

Judson Siebert: One question I can answer that was raised by a couple of public members is the taxable status. The property is on the tax rolls. My client is the owner of the property in this community; he has invested in this community, he pays taxes in this community, and he will continue to do so and there are no public monies at all. There is no tax credits associated with this project at all. It enhances the tax ratable rather than distracts from it. In regards with it becoming a commercial property, it is a commercial property. Zoned commercial business, it was built for a commercial purpose, we are simply trying to take advantage and bring life back into what has always been a commercial activity on this property. With regard to the traffic again, we are limiting the traffic to one delivery in the morning. It will be either a box van or

tractor trailer. If the Board wishes to impose time restrictions on the hours of delivery, we are happy to abide by those again our time window is 6:30 AM in turns of projected delivery. We have no intention on coming in at four in the morning, since our employees won't be there. We are happy to try to work with the City in terms of a routing plan for purposes of coming on and off the site. But again the type of traffic we're talking about is limited to the one larger vehicle in the morning and during the day standard size road vehicles, pick up trucks and Prius. I'm happy to entertain any other questions, but this complies with code and is consistent with what the building was built for and we ask the Board to proceed to close the application and issue a negative declaration and approve the application.

Chairman Holmes: I do have some questions and comments. A number of the concerns were about the traffic and other issues in the area: playgrounds, road conditions in the residential area. Has the applicant performed any kind of traffic study or any type of traffic analysis to indicate, what type of conditions or what factors that would mitigate?

Judson Siebert: There have not been any traffic studies.

Chairman Holmes: Thank you, Commissioners have your questions been answered? I will entertain a motion to table this public hearing. I personally would be interested in some more information on the traffic considerations based upon what I heard today.

Board Member Snyder: One comment I may have is there must be some historical information when this was an operating business. They must have had operating trucks that were generated by the business and is there any way to get historical information perhaps that can be compared to what might be proposed for this up coming business and to see if maybe there was a lesser impact or a greater impact.

Board Member Justino: I would like to make a statement to the applicant that the comments that were made by this Board early on regarding the blighted area and economic redevelopment there. As a Planning Board we need to look at how things filled out and as a process, I know that's not fair to you, but I think it's important that you speak to the Planning Department and or the Planning Commissioner to understand in what's being propose there and how your development will benefit with the long term plan.

Chairman Holmes: Thank you, Commissioners have your questions been answered? I will entertain a motion to table this public hearing.

**Board Member Griffith: Entertained a motion to table public hearing, Zamor second, all in favor.**

Staff Long: For the record, 260 S. 3<sup>Rd</sup> Avenue met all their notification requirements.

**3.2 Case #7-2013** 403 East Third Street (Section 165.73, Block 4032, Lot 26 & 42) located within the R2-4.5 and NB Zoning District.

The application of Jack Adesso, Esq. on behalf of Patriece Miller is seeking site plan review and a special use permit to convert an existing commercial facility into a funeral parlor.

**SEQRA Determination:** This action is a coordinated review and classified as an "Unlisted Action". In accordance with New York State Law, the Planning Board may not render any decisions concerning this application until the Zoning Board as the Lead Agency issues a SEQRA determination.

Staff Long: For the record the applicant has met all their notification requirements.

Chairman Holmes: Is there any correspondence from any agencies.

Staff Long: No correspondences.

Chairman Holmes: Is there representation for the applicant. **Let the record show, there's no representation for this applicant.**

### **3.3 Case #1-2010** 203 Gramatan Avenue (Section 165.54, Block 1122, Lot 1, 19 & 20)

The application of Doron Resheff on behalf of Atlantic Development is seeking an amendment to a site plan approval granted on July 7, 2010. The applicant seeks to reconfigure the traffic circulation.

**SEQRA Determination:** This action is a coordinated review and classified as an "Unlisted Action". In accordance with New York State Law, the Planning Board may render a decision provided that it finds that this application is supplement to the original application.

Ken Knuckles: Doron Resheff is the Project Manager who submitted this application on behalf of Atlantic Development and Kenwood Equities. I'm here on behalf of Atlantic Development and Kenwood Equities located at 76 McClean Avenue suite 220, Yonkers NY 10704 with me is Sheka Yamada she will do the actual presentation. As you indicated, we seek a slide amendment to our site plan approval which was granted on July 7, 2010.

Sheka Yamada: I'm a senior associate with JF55 and we're requesting to extend the previously approved permit with just have minor changes. It's not really a traffic re-route, which I believe was stated.

Chairman Holmes: Did you say minor changes?

Shaka Yamada: Yes. The first change is a Con Ed volt location were it previously showed the Con Ed volt on the proposed island. It's a sub-terrarium volt. Originally the volt was to be located on the proposed island at the Oakley Avenue intersection of N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and now it is being proposed to be located not on the island, but on the Eastern side of N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue at the Oakley Avenue intersection. Other than that, the traffic pattern location of the island remains the same as the previously approved application. The parking proposal parking spaces

previously along the street, all the paving, landscaping, and the vault will be the same as previously proposed, just re-located.

Board Member Justino: Does moving the vault, make more room for landscaping or less.

Shada Yamada: We would be adding more planting. The other change is: that architectural once you enter the building the parking ramp to the municipal parking that's on the second floor will have minor changes. Because the retail consultants didn't like the fact that the low ceilings over the ramp. In terms of planning and site there no changes.

Chairman Holmes: Any questions, comments?

Board Member Justino: You mentioned street scope, does all of that remains the same from the proposal? Pavers, plantings, street lights. The municipal garage that was to be repaired and improved by you, is that still also going to be done?

Shada Yamada: Yes. As far as cost it's a wash.

Board Member Selsey: Is there a facade change.

Shada Yamada: We thought that was for the ARB.

Board Member Selsey: Just for the record, we would like to see everything.

Shada Yamada: The north elevation: The change is the space that was previously proposed was a pre-casted concrete panel and we're changed that now to brick that matches the color of brick that was originally proposed. It's the same color, same brick, same material that been approved.

Chairman Holmes: We will need to see color as well as the ARB. We will make our conditions based on that. We won't hold you for that because that is part of site plan.

Shada Yamada: On the Gramatan Avenue elevation we are changing pre-casted concrete to brick. The northern elevation we had stucco being changed to brick.

Board Member Justino: Was there any change to storage of trash?

Shada Yamada: We only had this room with a trash compacter that would be serviced with the elevator; we've now added more space for the area.

Board Member Justino: During the construction, can we see what the plan for storage, parking, building materials, etc.

Ken Knuckles: Staging for phase I would be to utilize the Y site, which we also own. The rear of the Y site for temporary parking until phase I is done. With regards to phase II, actually there's discussion with proceeding with the Y side first, which was planned to be a senior

building on the corner of Oakley and Crary which is phase II. Phase III which is the Y site, there is contemplation now about proceeding with that site first. Ahead of phase II. At market rate.

Chairman Holmes: As far as the consideration, you said that phase II the Y site would be use for parking and it would also be used for construction staging and material. Where will construction employee parking be?

Ken Knuckles: It will go on that site, we have 52 spaces which should accommodate them or go into the municipal garage.

Chairman Holmes: Will that site be prepared prior to the start of construction of phase I.

Ken Knuckles: We've cleared the rear of the site and its suitable parking now.

Chairman Holmes: You're intent to use phase II. Is that to demolish or use it with the current building but with the available space? That's what we're unclear on.

Ken Knuckles: We're not demolishing the Rose Y until we're ready to build or proceed with phase II.

Chairman Holmes: So that site will be used for staging in it's current construction.

Board Member Justino: What is the timing for the municipal garage to happen?

Ken Knuckles: When we start construction on phase I, before we can get a CFO, the upgrade to the municipal garage has to be done. Once we get approval, we will start with the municipal garage. That will happen simultaneous to the construction of phase I. As far as funding, HFA (Housing Finance Agency) wants all of the regulatory issues resolved. Then it will take several months, hopefully we will be in construction early next year.

Staff Long: The applicant meets all requirements, and there are no comments form any agencies.

Chairman Holmes: Any member of the public wish to speak in favor or opposition of this application please come forward?

Bernadette Rainmoss: I reside and own the property of 123 Crary Ave. I have a question. I'm assuming there's a traffic study going on. Being that Crary Ave is a narrow street, I don't see how they are going to get construction equipment in and out of the property. I oppose this project.

Melissa Rayon: I own property at 124 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Please clarify where this property is located.

Chairman Holmes: Gramatan Avenue across from Hartley Park.

Melissa Rayon: Currently right now, is that a residential area. So it's going to be an apartment building with retail on the main level. My main concern, is parking. Is this public funded or private funding? Is this project going to raise the value or decrease the value of this area?

Chairman Holmes: Any member of the public wish to speak in favor or opposition of this application? If not, I'll will ask the applicant to come up and respond to some of the questions raised.

Ken Knuckles: With regards to the first speaker. I think she voiced her continuing disapproval of the project. It is my hope to the residents of Crary Avenue as well as the other surrounding areas when this project is done will see it for I believe it will be. It will be an enhancement to Downtown Mt. Vernon and it will begin, what I believe will be a renaissance in the Gramatan Avenue corridor. This housing is work force housing. The income levels will range from approximately \$40,000 per family to about \$66,000. This is middle income housing; there are 159 units, 75 % of which will be one bedroom apartments. The remaining 25% will be two bedroom apartments. There are no three bedroom apartments in this project. It is within walking distance to the railroad, we hope it will be attractive for people who work in Manhattan as well as White Plains and locally. The EIS which we submitted was approved by the Council as a part of our re-zoning addressed the parking issues on the second floor of this project, there will be 57 spaces which will replace each space of the existing space in the municipal garage. As well as a result of the \$300,000 we are putting into the municipal garage we will comply with our parking requirement in the municipal garage, so we don't believe there will be any real impact on the residents with regards to parking.

Chairman Holmes: Can you address the parking with regards to construction concern?

Ken Knuckles: As I said, the construction workers who arrive by car will likely park in the municipal garage. Those who come early will park in the temporary parking site those who come late will park in the municipal garage.

Board Member Snyder: Once you start construction, will your cars have some identification stickers in a designated area.

Ken Knuckles: We will have designated parking spaces on the second and third floor.

Chairman Holmes: Question about funding.

Ken Knuckles: There's HFA funding, tax credits these are funding sources that are available thru the public sector, but there are no subsidies coming from the City of Mount Vernon for this project and there's private debt, there's HFA debt bonds, there are tax credits that's what we have for the funding structure of the project.

Chairman Holmes: Garbage vandalizing as best I can describe it.

Ken Knuckles: I don't know if I can address that. I think the lady was referring to N. 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. I don't know if that pertains our project.

Board Member Trott: Will this project have tax abatement on it.

Ken Knuckles: We have a pilot payment that is consistent with the other projects that have been approved in the City.

Board Member Trott: What is that?

Ken Knuckles: \$800. per unit.

Board Member Trott: After the pilot expires: what is the length of the pilot, and when do the regular taxes kick in.

Ken Knuckles: The pilot runs consistently with the bonds, which is 30 years.

Board Member Trott: The pilot can't go for 30 years I know HFA quite well. Can you perhaps research that?

Ken Knuckles: I will get back to you on that.

Chairman Holmes: Any other questions from the Board, if not I will entertain a motion to close public hearing.

**Board Member Selsey: Make a motion to close public hearing. Second by Member Trott, all in favor.**

Chairman Holmes: Make a motion to determine **SEQRA Determination**. This SEQRA determination is to determine whether or not there were any changes to SEQRA. If not then I make a motion that we do not believe there are any changes

Board Member Griffith: Should we make a motion that we declare a negative declaration.

Board Member Trott: Second, all in favor

Board Member Justino: I would just add that, that motion states that this is a supplement to the original application where the City Council is the Lead Agency.

Chairman Holmes: I believe there's no question on SEQRA determination it's just weather or not it's a supplement to the original application. I'll take a third motion to approve or deny this application.

Board Member Justino: Just a couple of things, I would like to add a couple of conditions. It's for discussion. I would want to condition that you provide enough space for trash waste for

retail property. That's there's an expectable construction plan submitted to the Staff at the Planning Department as to staging of any materials and any debris and also relative to parking for the workers during construction, that there will be some system in place that states they will use the municipal garage wherever possible instead of using the streets.

Board Member Zamor: I agree with those conditions.

Board Member Justino: I recommend that the Board would consider those changes as stated above.

Board Member Zamor: Second,

Chairman Holmes: I will add one additional condition. That if we can strengthen that request for them to insist that the construction or employee parking be in the parking facility as oppose to on the City streets.

Board Member Zamor: Second

**All in favor - unanimous**

#### **ITEM # 4 LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION AND RECOMMENDATION - Zoning Board of Appeals**

**4.1 Calendar No. 1703-Z** 8 Alden Place (Section 159.63, Block 1001, Lot 7) located within the RMF-15 Zoning District.

The applicant is seeking to construct a 4-story, nine unit multifamily townhouse style dwelling.

Staff Long: Mr. Chair, at the last Board meeting the Zoning Board ask you for a recommendation concerning 8 Alden Place. At the last Zoning Board meeting the applicant amended their plans to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Zoning Board is asking you for a recommendation based on the amendment. The other item in front of you is your determination on whether the Zoning Board should be Lead Agency. You can't comment on the recommendation, but you can comment on the Lead Agency.

Board Member Zamor: I would like to make a motion that ZBA act as Lead Agency for this particular project on Alden Place.

Board Member Selsey: Second

Chairman Holmes: I would like to amend that motion to the Zoning Board seeking Lead Agency.

Board Member Selsey: Second **All in Favor** I's have

Chairman Holmes: In regards to 8 Alden Place, I will entertain a motion to Zoning Board that this Board is not in receipt of any additional information therefore we cannot comment.

Board Member Justino: So Moved

Board Member Trott: Second All in Favor The I's have it.

**4.2 Calendar No. 1704-Z** 316 West First Street (Section 186.28 Block 3008, Lot 6 & 7) located within the NB Zoning District.

The applicant seeks the aforementioned variances to construct a self-storage facility.

Board Member Trott: I make a motion that we convey to the Zoning Board that we have insufficient information to comment at this point, but we urge them to consider the fact that this physical location is a gateway to Mt. Vernon.

Board Member Griffith: Second All in favor.

Chairman Holmes: Motion to adjourn.

**Note:** Work Sessions will be open to the public but closed to public participation subject to the Open Meetings Law, [Section 105 of the New York State Public Officers Law, Article 7].

**Note:** Items listed on the agenda are subject to change and amendments and/or additions may be placed on the agenda.

**Note:** The Planning Board will hold its work session on Tuesday September 3, 2013 at 6:30pm in the Planning Commissioner's Office.

Following the September 4, 2013 Regular Board Meeting the next regular meeting of the City Planning Board is scheduled to be held on Wednesday, October 2, 2013.

William Long  
Planning Administrator

cc: Ernest D. Davis, Mayor  
Nichelle Johnson, Acting Chief of Staff  
George Brown, City Clerk  
Hina Sherwani, Corporation Counsel

Lou Albano, Acting Planning Commissioner  
Mark Warren, Building Commissioner  
Press