

**VILLAGE OF CROTON-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
MINUTES FOR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2012**

Present: Chairman Luntz
Mr. Aarons
Ms. Allen
Mr. Kauderer
Mr. Krisky

Also Present: Daniel O'Connor, Village Engineer

1) Call to order 8:06 p.m.

2) New Business

a) Croton Commons -- 171 South Riverside Avenue (Sec. 78.12 Blk 3 Lot 4) -- Amended Site Plan for façade renovations (replacement of awning and awning structure).

Douglas McClure, Architect for the applicant, presented the application for an Amended Site Plan. He explained that the Landlord for the Croton Commons Shopping Center is interested in removing the existing dilapidated awning and awning structure and replace it with a new standing seam metal roof and updated signage system. He provided details for the proposed scope of work which included a discussion about the lighting, new gutter system tied into the existing drainage system, installation of new vertical supports on existing cantilevered steel beams to support the structure for new roof, and the color scheme of the awning and signage.

Mr. Krisky asked if the tenants were satisfied with the plan. Mr. McClure stated that there was a positive response. The signage will be paid for by the landlord.

Chairman Luntz stated that the next step is to call for a public hearing. The public hearing will occur at the next meeting on May 8, 2012. This application will be referred to the Advisory Board of the Visual Environment (VEB) for its recommendations on signage. The Planning Board gives a positive recommendation on this application. Ms. Allen made a motion to call for a public hearing and a referral to the VEB, Mr. Krisky seconded the motion, and the motion carried by a vote of 5-0, all in favor.

3) Old Business

a) John Boulos -- Piney Point Avenue (Sec. 79.13 Blk. 4 Lot 44) -- Minor Site Plan Application for a single family dwelling.

b) Mark Franzoso -- Piney Point Avenue (Sec. 79.13 Blk. 4 Lot 45) -- Minor Site Plan Application for a single family dwelling.

Ms. Jody Cross, Attorney, and Ed Gemmola, Architect, presented on behalf of the applicants. Mark Franzoso was also present. Ms. Cross explained that this application was before the Board (prior to the April 2011 meeting) in June of 2010. (Minutes of this meeting are available on the website).

Ms. Cross stated that the geotechnical reports have been completed and the reports have concluded that this project is both feasible and safe. Ms. Cross stated that although these properties are sloped, there will be very little disturbance and will not go above the steep slopes thresholds required for the steep slopes permit. The calculations did not include stormwater facilities or water utilities but even with these considered, the threshold for steep slopes would not be met.

Mr. Kauderer asked if the piers underground and the whole footprint of the house had been considered when calculating the steep slopes disturbance, and he questioned whether this should be considered in the steep slopes disturbance calculations. He asked the Village Engineer for guidance. The Village Engineer read the requirements for a steep slopes permit under chapter 195-3B in the Village Code. Mr. Kauderer asked, based on these requirements if there was enough light for the vegetation to grow under the piers of the proposed house. Mr. Gemmola stated there would be enough sunlight for plantings. Mr. Kauderer stated that he believed it would be worthwhile to see a recalculation of the steep slopes disturbance under the assumption that the whole footprint of the house is a disturbance. Mr. Gemmola maintained that the numbers would still be under the steep slopes threshold.

Ms. Cross stated that they will complete the calculations and have it in writing. The Village Engineer stated that there is an exemption from the issuance of a permit if vegetation is maintained and no regrading is involved.

Ms. Allen had questions about the amount of sand in the soil and the results of the geotechnical analysis. She also questioned whether construction vehicles would be able to go on the site since the site was so steep. She wanted to see a lot of details about the soil in order to be assured that it is safe and will not slide.

Chairman Luntz asked Mr. Gemmola to discuss the geotechnical report. Mr. Gemmola stated that the information on the report states that the site is safe and will not slide with the construction of a house. The owner is willing to hire engineers to do the utilities in addition to hiring a structural engineer to design the footings and for the construction of the house. All footings will be in rock. There are three slopes--upper, middle, and lower. The proposed houses will be built on the middle slopes which will negate any sliding of the slope.

Mr. Kauderer had questions about the safety of the buildings and about surface slides based on what he had read in the geotechnical reports. He expressed concern about the possibility of surface slides during very wet conditions such as in hurricane conditions. Mr. Gemmola again stated that the rock is not going to slide and the house would be built in the rock. Mr. Gemmola maintained that there could be slides if there were no house; however the geotechnical report

states that this is not a possibility if one is building in the middle slope. The retaining walls and ground anchors stabilize the construction of the house.

Ms. Cross stated that it is important for the applicants to have a structural engineer on board and they would make sure that the Village Engineer was satisfied that the houses were safe.

Ms. Allen had questions about the equipment needed for construction on such a steep slope. Ms. Cross agreed that it is a difficult site and not a traditional flat site, but suggested that the construction techniques being considered were specifically designed for houses built into slopes such as haiku houses and houses with stilts. The construction techniques used would minimize the damage to steep slopes.

Mr. Krisky asked the Village Engineer what he thought of the report. The Village Engineer explained that the geotechnical engineer had made some recommendations for more specific borings to be done to see what the condition of the rock is (pier foundation). There is also a recommendation for the piers to provide ground anchors which would help with soil slides. Different designs for parking areas were recommended for lot 44 and recommendations for different retaining wall systems were recommended for lot 45. The report suggested that the project would require geotechnical engineers to be on site during construction. The Village Engineer also emphasized that the logistics of the constructions will affect the slope disturbance. A temporary construction road might be required and the location of the equipment would have to be factored into the slope disturbance.

Ms. Cross stated that her applicants understand that there needs to be more engineering work on the site. She wanted to see if the Planning Board was conceptually "okay" with the idea of haiku houses. She understood that the next step for the applicant would be to go to the Zoning Board for variances for the retaining walls because they are higher than 15 ft and closer to the street than the principal structure. However, Ms. Cross added, that it doesn't make sense for the applicant to go ahead with the project, given the money and time required, if the Planning Board does not agree in theory with the idea of the haiku houses. Ms. Cross stated the idea is both creative and environmentally sensitive and allows the applicant to use their land.

Mr. Kauderer stated that speaking for himself he would want to hear from the Zoning Board and the Village Engineer that the houses were safe. He would want to have the Public Hearing and hear what the neighbors had to say. The Village Engineer stated that the application to the Planning Board was a Minor Site Plan and as such would not require a public hearing. However, the Planning Board as an open meeting can decide to accept comments. There is a public hearing as part of the Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Kauderer stated he couldn't in good faith tell the applicant whether or not the Planning Board was "okay" with the plan until the applicant went to the ZBA.

Mr. Gemmola added that the applicant wanted to know if this is conceptually something that Croton is willing to accept. His client was willing to invest a sizable amount of money to make

everyone comfortable with the idea but needed to know if ultimately there would be acceptance for them.

Ms. Cross stated that many of the concerns were engineering issues and the applicant planned to hire an engineer to address these issues. Ms. Cross also stated that there are construction techniques to build on steep slopes; there are houses that are built on stilts to minimize disturbance. Mr. Krisky asked if there were any houses on piers in Croton to which the Village Engineer responded no. The Village Engineer stated that more specific borings would have been completed in the rock.

Mr. Krisky stated that the Planning Board does not know how the public will react. The Planning Board doesn't know what the outcome will be.

Ms. Cross asked why public reaction was relevant when there is no public hearing. However she understands that the neighbors are concerned about some of the engineering and aesthetic aspects of the application and the applicant is prepared to address those concerns.

Chairman Luntz stated that the Planning Board will need to hear from the geotechnical engineer in addition to a structural engineer in order to get the Planning Board comfortable with the plan. The Planning Board will be taking a serious look at the plan. Chairman Luntz agreed with Mr. Kauderer that as the next step the applicant will need variances from the ZBA for both the properties. There will be an opportunity for a public hearing so that neighbors can voice their concerns. The Zoning Board meeting provides an opportunity for a public forum but Chairman Luntz emphasized that the Planning Board also is open to public comment even when there is not a public hearing and takes public comment into consideration.

Ms. Cross stated that they were prepared to alleviate whatever concerns the neighbors might have and it appeared that the next step would be for the applicant to go to the Zoning Board and to hire Bruce Donahue, environmental consultant, complete a tree survey. The applicants' engineer would also take the consultant's report into consideration.

Mr. Kauderer stated that the applicant may want to wait to hire Mr. Donahue until knowing the outcome of the decision about the variance. Mr. Gemmola asked if it were possible to have a joint Zoning Board and Planning Board meeting since the structural engineer was from Pennsylvania. The Planning Board believed this would not be advisable since the Zoning Board has a different purpose from the Planning Board. Mr. Kauderer stated that his understanding is that the Zoning Board's singular focus is to make a decision on variances. Ms. Cross agreed that it was best to keep it a separate process. The Village Engineer stated the ZBA will also be concerned about the safety of the structure and the aesthetics.

The Village Engineer reiterated the need for the applicants to look at all the design options that work with the geotechnical report. He stated that there needs to be a thorough analysis of steep slopes. The calculations should include the logistics of the construction and the stormwater system as disturbances.

Ms. Allen asked about a previously mentioned possibility for a site visit to similar houses being built. Ms. Cross responded that, unfortunately, the owners would not give an address and there was no way of visiting the site.

Mr. Kauderer stated that he would not be comfortable giving any kind of recommendation from the Planning Board to the Zoning Board at this point in time. Ms. Allen agreed.

Chairman Luntz recommended that the applicant go to the ZBA and work through that process. In the meantime, Chairman Luntz stated that it appeared that there was more engineering work to be done. The Planning Board would review the application if the Zoning Board granted a variance.

The Planning Board agreed to hear members of the public who were in attendance at the meeting.

John Gochman, 19 Piney Point, spoke about Piney Point Avenue being a hazardous and narrow--a double dead-end street. He mentioned that trucks have to back up to turn around because of how narrow the street is. He described how someone had died in a major fire on the street because the fire truck could not get up the driveway. Every time there is a bad storm, there are tree limbs that fall on these two properties. The Planning Board should also consider that this property is near the Croton River.

A resident of Nordica Drive, a professional engineer, stated that his concerns were specific to erosion issues and drainage. He believes that the effect of this construction will result in potential and continued erosion and that this is an eroded site where the rock is fractured and porous. He recommended that the geotechnical report should study the erosion issue in more depth. He believes that this is an environmentally very sensitive site and very relevant to the public.

Mr. Steve Kaplan, 29 Piney Point, stated that he had sent a letter to the Planning Board earlier in the week and he too had safety and environmental concerns. He believes the street is extremely dangerous. He concurred with other residents that environmentally this is an important piece of property to Croton since there is lots of wildlife on the property and close to Croton gorge.

A resident, 45 Piney Point, agreed with his neighbors. A resident of 28 Piney Point echoed that she concurred with her neighbors. A resident of 25 Piney Point stated that even village garbage trucks won't go up Piney Point.

Chairman Luntz thanked the public for attending the meeting.

Planning Board Meeting
April 24, 2012

b) Steel Styles, LLC -- 50 Half Moon Bay (Sec. Blk. Lot) -- Application for an Amended Site Development Plan and Wetland Activity permit for new single-family dwelling.

Mr. Whitney Singleton, attorney from Singleton, Davis, and Singleton was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Bob Davis was unable to attend the meeting.

Chairman Luntz stated that the resolution granting Amended Site Plan approval to 50 Half Moon Bay was before the Board. No site plans changes have been made. Chairman Luntz adjourned the meeting at 9:16 so that Board members could read the resolution. The meeting reconvened at 9:30 p.m..

The draft resolution was reviewed and each of the conditions discussed. **The resolution, as amended, is attached.**

There was discussion about construction materials and vehicles in the parking area. Mr. Aarons asked if the Planning board wanted to place a limit on the parking spaces that construction workers could use. He also wondered how to handle the issue of construction machinery on the parking lot. He expressed concern that parking spots would be limited for residents if a construction vehicle was taking up too many parking spots. The Planning Board agreed that the condition will stipulate that the use of the parking lot during construction is limited to a maximum of six parking spaces. The Village Engineer will be allowed to permit a temporary increase in the number of parking spaces used during off-peak season provided the increase is justified and is for a limited duration. The Village Engineer pointed out that there is a difference between accepting deliveries of construction materials and the storage of those materials. The condition shall state that the parking area will not be used for storage of construction materials.

Mr. Kauderer expressed concern about construction vehicles blocking parked cars. The Village Engineer stated that this was a police matter and it is illegal to block another car.

The Planning Board discussed the fence that is depicted on the site plan. A condition was added stating that the five foot fence shown on the site plan depicted on the northwest corner shall be either a 5 ft. picket fence or a 4 ft. stone wall.

Mr. Kauderer moved to accept the resolution as amended, seconded by Mr. Aarons. Chairman Luntz called for a roll call vote by seniority.

Ms. Allen: opposed

Mr. Kauderer: in favor

Mr. Aarons: in favor –Mr. Aarons stated that he does not believe the property is appropriate for a house of this scale and size but he is constrained to vote in favor due to the requirements of the law since the property is zoned for residential use along with other uses

Chairman Luntz --in favor

Mr. Krisky opposed-- Mr. Krisky stated that he was opposed because it was too large a structure in the wrong place contiguous to parkland.

Planning Board Meeting
April 24, 2012

The motion carried 3-2 in favor.

4) Minutes

The approval of the minutes of March 27, 2012 were postponed to the next meeting.

5) Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was duly adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronnie Rose
Planning Board Secretary

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Steel Style Properties, LLC has applied to the Planning Board for Amended Site Plan Approval and for a Wetlands Activity Permit on a property located at 50 Half Moon Bay Drive, in the Waterfront Development District, which is designated on the Tax Map of the Village as Section 78.16 Block 1 Lot 3.

WHEREAS, the proposed project constitutes an amendment to the Half Moon Bay Development Site Plan to revise the proposed development on the above referenced property from a restaurant to a single family dwelling; and

WHEREAS, under the requirements of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the Planning Board has determined that this project is an Unlisted Action; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has submitted to the Planning Board a Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) dated July 7, 2011 and a Coastal Assessment Form (CAF) dated July 15, 2011; and

WHEREAS, a Public Hearing before the Planning Board was commenced on the Amended Site Plan application on Tuesday, October 25, 2011 and closed on March 13, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board referred this application on September 14, 2011 to the Water Control Commission for recommendation on the issuance of a Wetlands Activity Permit, and on October 20, 2011 the Water Control Commission reviewed the Proposed Action and made their recommendations to the Planning Board in a memorandum dated October 25, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board referred this application to the Trails Committee on September 14, 2011 for their review and recommendations, and the Trails Committee reviewed the Proposed Action and made recommendations to the Planning Board in a memorandum dated September 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Planning referred this application to the Advisory Board on the Visual Environment (VEB) in accordance with Village Code Section 60-3 on September 14, 2011 and the VEB reviewed the Proposed Action and in a memorandum dated October 19, 2011, made their recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board referred this application to the Waterfront Advisory Committee (WAC) on September 22, 2011, for a preliminary recommendation of consistency with the policies of the Village's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) and the WAC, in their memorandum to the Planning Board, dated October 20, 2011, recommended to the Planning Board that the Proposed Action be found consistent (preliminary review) with the LWRP; and

WHEREAS, based on the WAC's preliminary recommendation of consistency with the LWRP, and the Planning Board's review, the Planning Board determined that there will be no significant adverse environmental impacts resulting from the Proposed Action and issued a Negative Declaration on March 27, 2012 and referred this application to the Waterfront Advisory Committee for a final recommendation of consistency; and

WHEREAS, the WAC, in their memorandum to the Planning Board dated April 3, 2012, recommended to the Planning Board that the Proposed Action be found consistent with the LWRP; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board hereby determines that the Proposed Action complies with and is consistent with the policies, standards and conditions set forth in the Village's LWRP for the reasons set forth in the Environmental Assessment Form and Negative Declaration which have been issued in connection with the Proposed Action all of which are incorporated herein by reference, and in accordance with the recommendation of the Village's Waterfront Advisory Committee.

WHEREAS, under section 120-4 of the Village Code the Planning Board is the approving authority for the issuance of an Excavation and Filling Permit and in accordance with section 120-3(C) of the Village Code the approval of the Amended Site Plan incorporates the excavation and filling permit, subject to the conditions specified below.

WHEREAS, under section 208-16(C) of the Village Code the Planning Board is the approving authority for the issuance of a Tree Removal Permit and in accordance with section 208-16(F) of the Village Code the approval of the Amended Site Plan includes the approval to remove the two trees noted on the site plan to be removed, subject to the conditions specified below.

WHEREAS, under section 227-7(F) of the Village Code the Planning Board is the approving authority for the issuance of a Wetland Activity Permit and hereby issues a Wetland Activity Permit, subject to the conditions specified below.

WHEREAS, under section 196-3(C) of the Village Code the Planning Board is the approving authority for the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and hereby approves the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, subject to the conditions specified below.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the application submitted by Steel Style Properties, LLC for an Amended Site plan approval and a Wetlands Activity Permit for a single-family dwelling on property located at 50 Half Moon Bay Drive, as shown on Sheet 1 entitled "Site Plan Lot 1 at Half Moon Bay Marina" dated November 10, 2003, last revised March 20, 2012 and Sheet 2 entitled "Details/Notes/Elevations" dated March 20, 2012; graphic rendering of west elevation of house entitled "HMB_Water_Scene_composite_clubhouse.jpg" dated March 21, 2012 and attached as "Exhibit A", prepared by Ralph G. Mastro Monaco, P.E. P.C. subject to the following conditions:

1. The foregoing recitals are incorporated herein as if set forth at length.
2. That, the architectural plans submitted for the building permit application substantially comply with the rendering noted above and the building elevations and footprint shown on the site plan.
3. That, the walking path in the conservation easement be relocated as shown on the site plan and a substantial temporary fence be installed between the path and the construction area prior to the commencement of construction, with the temporary fence being a minimum of two feet from the edge of the path.
4. That, an offer of dedication to the Village be made for the small triangular parcel of land noted on the site plan where the relocated path meets the parking area. The deed of said dedication of land shall be filed with the Westchester County Clerk's Office and documentation of filing shall be submitted to the Village prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. That, any vehicles associated with the development of the property utilize the applicant's property for parking to the greatest extent practicable. The applicant shall minimize use of the adjacent parking lot during construction to the greatest extent practicable. The use of the parking lot during construction is limited to a maximum of six (6) parking spaces. The Village Engineer is allowed to permit a temporary increase in the number of parking spaces used during off-peak season provided the increase is justified and is for a limited duration. The parking lot will not be used for storing construction materials.
6. That, no gate be installed on the walking path in the conservation easement..
7. That, the owner of the property shall maintain the path and landscaping in the conservation easement in accordance with the terms thereof.
8. That, spot repairs be made to the rip rap shoreline protection system in the area of the culverts including repair of any sink holes at the top of slope along the length of the path.
9. That, the transition from the parking lot to the relocated trail be ADA compliant.
10. That the five foot fence shown on the site plan depicted on the northwest corner shall be either a 5 ft. picket fence or a 4 ft. stone wall.
11. That, in accordance with sections 120-7 and 120-8 of the Village Code the following conditions are established for the excavation and fill permit:
 - a. That, suitable fencing be provided to guard any excavation greater than four feet in depth.
 - b. That, excavation and/or filling operations shall not be permitted between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. Sunday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 10:00 a.m. Friday through Sunday.

- c. That, appropriate dust-control measures shall be implemented on-site and on access roads and any traveled areas used in connection with any work under this chapter to protect the public and surrounding area against windblown sand and dust.
 - d. That, removal of soil or other material from the ground and/or placement of fill on the ground shall not prevent or interfere with the orderly development of land in the vicinity, shall not unreasonably impede traffic flow, parking or use of the trail in the conservation easement.
 - e. That, to prevent the earth of adjoining property from caving in before permanent supports have been provided for the sides of such excavation, any person causing any excavation to be made shall provide such sheet piling and bracing as may be necessary, plans for which are to be submitted to and approved by the Village Engineer prior to any such excavation being undertaken.
 - f. That any excess soil from the excavation shall be removed from the site immediately but in no event more than 20 days from excavation.
 - g. That, in accordance with section 120-7 of the Village Code the applicant shall file with the Village a suitable bond or other security to cover the completion of conditions (a) through (f) above, said bond to be filed prior to the issuance of a building permit with amount of the bond to be approved in accordance with section 120-7 of the Village Code.
12. That, in accordance with sections 227-8(F) and 227-8(G) of the Village Code the following conditions are established as part of the Wetland Activity Permit:
- a. That the work conducted under the Wetland Activity Permit shall be open to inspection during daylight hours, including weekends and holidays, by the approving authority or its designated representative or the Village Engineer.
 - b. That, no work shall commence until the installation of the sediment and erosion control devices has been completed and found acceptable by the Village Engineer.
 - c. That the Wetland Activity Permit expiration date shall be 4/24/2015 or upon completion of the work specified therein.
 - d. That the Wetland Activity Permit holder shall notify the Village Engineer of the date on which the work is to begin at least five days in advance of such commencement date.
 - e. That the Wetland Activity Permit shall be prominently displayed at the project site during the undertaking of the activities authorized by the permit.
 - f. Within 30 days after completion of all work authorized under a permit issued in accordance with this chapter, the applicant shall notify the Village Engineer of such completion.
13. That, the following conditions are established as part of the approval of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:
- a. That, a copy of the SWPPP shall be retained at the site of the land development activity during construction from the date of initiation of construction activities to the date of final stabilization.
 - b. That, no work shall commence until the installation of the sediment and erosion control devices has been completed and found acceptable by the Village Engineer.

- c. That, each contractor and subcontractor who will be involved in soil disturbance and/or stormwater management practice installation shall sign and date a copy of the following certification statement before undertaking any land development activity: "I certify under penalty of law that I understand and agree to comply with the terms and conditions of the stormwater pollution prevention plan. I also understand that it is unlawful for any person to cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards." Copies of these statements shall be delivered to the Village Engineer.
 - d. That, the certification must include the name and title of the person providing the signature, address and telephone number of the contracting firm; the address (or other identifying description) of the site; and the date the certification is made.
 - e. That, the certification shall contain proof that each contractor who will be involved in a land development activity has obtained training and/or certification in proper erosion and sedimentation control practices. Such certification shall become part of the SWPPP for the land development activity and shall be retained on-site.
 - f. That, the applicable stormwater facility maintenance, inspection and repair requirements in section 196-9 of the Village Code be complied with.
 - g. That, the applicant shall contact the Village Engineer at least 48 hours before any of the work inspections listed in section 196-10(A)(1) of the Village Code are performed.
 - h. That, in accordance with section 196-11(A) of the Village Code the applicant shall file with the Village a suitable bond or other security to cover the full and faithful completion of all land development activities related to compliance with all conditions set forth by the Village in its approval of the stormwater pollution prevention plan. Said bond to be filed prior to the issuance of a building permit with amount of the bond to be approved by the Village Engineer.
14. That, in accordance with section 208-18 and 208-19 of the Village Code the following conditions are established for the approval to remove trees:
- a. That, as shown on the site plan six replacement trees are to be planted.
 - b. That, the two trees to remain shall be protected with tree trunk armoring and root zone protection fence.
 - c. That, in accordance with section 208-19 of the Village Code the applicant shall file with the Village a suitable bond or other security to cover the completion of conditions (a) and (b) above, said bond to be filed prior to the issuance of a building permit with amount of the bond to be approved by the Village Engineer.
15. All fees associated with the Amended Site Plan application, Wetland Activity Permit, and any other permits issued thereafter be paid in full prior to the issuance of a building permit,
16. That, according to section 230-22 (K)(5)(c) [Waterfront Development District] of the Village Code:
- a. If no construction has begun or if no use has been established in the project within one year from the date of the adoption of the Planning Board's resolution

of site development plan approval said approval shall lapse and be of no further effect.

- b. If construction has begun or if the use has been established within said one-year period, but if the development has not been completed within three years of said approval, then said approval shall lapse. The Planning Board may, in its discretion, extend said three-year completion period, upon application prior to its expiration, if such extension is warranted by the particular circumstances of the development.

The Planning Board of the Village of
Croton-on-Hudson, New York

Robert Luntz, Chairperson	Date
Mark Aarons	
Fran Allen	
Bruce Kauderer	
Steven Krisky	

The motion to approve was made by Mr. Kauderer, seconded by Mr. Aarons, and carried by a vote of 3 to 2, in favor. Mr. Krisky opposed on the grounds that he believes the proposed action is too large a structure in the wrong place contiguous to parkland. Ms. Allen opposed for the same reasons.

The resolution, as amended, was approved at the Planning Board meeting held on April 24, 2012.