

**VILLAGE OF CROTON-ON-HUDSON**  
**Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, May 12, 2015**

**PRESENT:** Rob Luntz  
Rocco Mastronardi  
Steve Krisky

**ABSENT:** Bruce Kauderer  
Janet Mainiero

Also Present: Daniel O'Connor, P.E., Village Engineer

**1. Call to order**

Chairman Luntz called the meeting to order at 8:10 p.m.

**2. PUBLIC HEARING**

*a) Maroon Realty Inc. – 25 South Riverside Avenue (Sec. 78.08 Blk. 5 Lot 43) – Application for Amended Site Plan approval for renovations to store front and entranceway.*

**PRESENT:** Frank Manicchio, owner of 25 South Riverside Avenue

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED:** Mr. Krisky made a motion to open the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Mastronardi and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

**DISCUSSION:** There were no comments from the public. The Planning Board reviewed the draft resolution. The Planning Board recommended that not only should the Advisory Board on the Visual Environment look at the tenant space signage, but the VEB also should review the overall signage of the building (including BestWeb).

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED:** Mr. Mastronardi made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Krisky, and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

**MOTION:** Mr. Mastronardi made a motion to approve the resolution as amended, seconded by Mr. Krisky, and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

*b) Kimelman, David – 53 Old Post Road North (Se. 67.20 Blk. 2 Lot 24) – Application for two-lot subdivision for the purpose of dividing the property into two legal lots, with each of the existing dwellings on its own lot.*

**PRESENT:** Luke Hilpert, Esq., and David Kimelman, owner

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED:** Mr. Mastronardi made a motion to open the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Krisky, and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

**DISCUSSION:** There were no comments from the public. Chairman Luntz noted that the memo from the Waterfront Advisory Committee had been received and reviewed. Mr. Hilpert stated that he would add a note on the subdivision map that shows and labels the wetlands (watercourse) buffer zone.

The Planning Board reviewed the SEQR (Part 617) criteria of significance and agreed that the proposed subdivision, which has pre-existing structures on the property, would not cause an adverse effect on the environment. The application will be referred to the Waterfront Advisory Committee for a final consistency review.

The board was in receipt of the easements, and the Village Engineer stated that he would refer them to the Village Attorney for his review. Mr. Krisky noted that, although a minor point, in the easement (p. 5) there was a note about snow accumulations to three inches or more, and that the village code states two or more inches of snow (Section 215-29 seasonal parking “when snow accumulates to two or more inches”). Mr. Hilpert stated he would correct this.

Mr. Hilpert confirmed that a note would be added to the deed for lot 2 as recommended by the WAC, that should there be any future construction, there is an understanding that a wetlands permit may be required for work in the buffer zone.

The Village Engineer explained that at the next meeting, the Planning Board would make its determination of consistency and vote on the resolution of preliminary subdivision approval.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED:** As there were no comments from the public, Mr. Mastronardi made a motion to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Krisky, and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

**MOTION:** Mr. Krisky made a motion to issue a negative declaration, having reviewed the SEQR criteria of environmental significance, that the proposed two-lot subdivision did not have any significant negative impact on the environment, and requested that the written determination of findings be prepared by staff. Mr. Mastronardi seconded this motion, and the vote carried 3-0.

**MOTION:** Mr. Krisky made a motion to refer the application to the Waterfront Advisory Committee for a final review, seconded by Mr. Mastronardi, and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

### **3. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

*a) 15 North Riverside Avenue (Sec. 78.08 Blk. 3 Lot 62) – Discussion of proposed expansion of auto repair garage and nonstandard parking configuration prior to application to Zoning Board of Appeals for variances.*

**PRESENT:** Mark Aarons, Esq. and Heike Schneider, Architect

Mr. Aarons, and Ms. Schneider noted that they wanted to informally discuss the issues with regard to parking at the Hudson View Automotive Repair, 15 North Riverside Avenue. The owner would like to add two bays to his existing auto repair shop. Mr. Aarons noted that the business is growing and Mr. Anfiteatro (the owner) was unable to accommodate all the repairs at the current space. The building used to be in a C-2 Zoning District, changed to a C-1 Zoning district which made the business a legal non-conforming use. It was understood

that they would be expanding the non-conforming use and would need a variance, either area or use, to continue with the expansion plans.

The discussion was focused on the proposed parking layout and to determine if the Planning Board would agree to the parking as shown on the proposed plan, or if the applicant would need to get an additional variance for two parking spaces from the Zoning Board. The ten parking spaces are shown on the plan, with four of the employee parking spaces back to back. Ms. Schneider stated that the applicant was required to provide 10 off street parking spaces. The proposed plan provides four employee parking spaces on the right of the building and five customer parking spaces. The parking spaces on the right of the building would be for employee parking only.

Mr. Krisky asked if people would be able to come in and go out easily from the parking spots, and Ms. Schneider and Mr. Aarons stated that spaces in the back were for employees, the parking area in front of the bays then becomes the transient space, and the other spaces are for storage of vehicles.

Mr. Krisky expressed some concern about emergency vehicle access in the winter, and Mr. Aarons stated that the usage was not going to change, and in fact the parking would be more organized than it is currently.

Mr. Krisky also asked about a handicap space and there was some discussion about the location of an ADA compliant space and whether the requirement could be waived. The Village Engineer stated that only the New York State Department of State could waive the requirement.

It was agreed amongst the board members that the stacked parking as set forth in the submitted document would be acceptable and did not present any problem with those present.

#### **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Krisky made a motion to approve the minutes of April 28, 2015, seconded by Mr. Mastonardi, and carried all in favor by a vote of 3-0.

#### **5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ronnie L. Rose, Secretary to the Planning Board