

## Planning Board Minutes

February 2, 2023

**Acting Chairperson Mary D’Andrea** welcomed everyone to the February 2, 2023, meeting of the Amityville Planning Board at 7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Stephen Greenwald, Chairperson  
Mary D’Andrea, Member  
Kelly Medwig, Member  
Laura Ellis, Member  
Justin Kennedy, Alternate Member

Other Attendees: Michael Breitweg, Building Inspector  
Melanie Macomber, Secretary to the Board

Absent: Amanda Lowe, Member

The Board and attendees recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

After introducing The Board, **Chairperson Greenwald** informed applicants that they are hereby notified that all agreed upon concessions, promises, pledges, assurances, or declarations given by them or their duly appointed agents, during their hearing process shall become stipulations to any approvals given by this Board.

**Chairperson Greenwald** informed the applicants that they must adhere to the plans submitted in conjunction with this application as approved by The Board, any deviation from the approved plans may require the application to be re-called by this Board. Additionally, the applicant must stick to the plans that were discussed, any plans that deviate from what is being presented or discussed tonight must be submitted to the building inspector and may require applicant to come before this board again. The applicant must obtain building permits once the plans are approved by the building inspector, the applicant.

**Chairperson Greenwald** motioned to approve the January 5, 2023, Planning Board Minutes.

Vote on Motion:	Mary D’Andrea, Member	aye
	Kelly Medwig, Member	aye
	Laura Ellis, Member	aye
	Justin Kennedy, Alternate	aye

Motion carried: 4 ayes 0 nays.

Application of Andrew Gismondi. Applicant seeks architectural review and approval for the proposed construction of an approximate 1,238 square foot first floor addition pursuant to Section 24-6 A (1) (h) of the Village Code. Premises located on the South side of Morris Street, 410 feet East of South Ketcham Avenue in a “B” Residence District known as 70 Morris Street a/k/a SCTM# 101-11-8-3.1

**Mr. Grismondi:** After introducing himself to the Board discussed the submittal of the revised plans. Original plans were not clear. Last time, we were here we presented the Board with the type of batten and siding we would be using.

Member of the Board discussed the application.







Discussion was made regarding the dumpster on the property. The dumpster does not belong to the applicant and was placed by the landlord.

Ms. Beaubrun discussed the importance of presenting a substantial business. The applicants discussed the current conditions of the property and how it has a negative impact on their business.

Chairperson Greenwald addressed the concerns made in the letter. The concerns are not a matter for the Planning Board to handle, but that of Code Enforcement.

Members of the audience were invited to speak for or against the application.

**Ms. Katrina Conway:** spoke against the application. Ms. Conway referred to the storage containers as eyesores and disrupts the quality of life in the community. Ms. Conway questioned, where Ms. Beaubrun lived at the property, and asked for the correct address. There has been no improvements made to the property since new ownership. Ms. Conway made it clear that there are other storage facilities in the area that the applicant could use.

Correction to address was made on the record.

**Member Medwig:** Mentioned that the storage will not be the issue of the eyesore, but the tenants are the issue of the eyesore.

**Chairperson Greenwald:** Mentioned that the idea of the sheds was to remove the storage sheds from the property.

It was reiterated that the Planning Board did not handle landlord/tenant issues. That these concerns needed to be addressed to Code Enforcement. The Board is limited on what can be done on the upkeep of the property.

Ms. Conway further discussed her opposition to the sheds being placed on the property and the condition of the property.

Tenant does have permission from the property owner to place the sheds on the property.

**Ms. Conway:** Questioned the placement of the shed on the property, and if there was a variance required.

The side of the shed is smaller than when a variance would be needed. It is permitted because it is a business zoned property.

**Member D'Andrea:** Addressed that the issue remains that the property abuts residential zoned property.

**Ms. Conway:** Read a letter from Ms. Santos who is opposed to the placement of the sheds on the property.

**Member Medwig:** Mentioned that the concern seems to be that the sheds are going to be placed in addition to the containers that are already there.

Ms. Conway was sympathetic to the business owner but reiterated that she was not pleased with the sheds being placed, and felt it hurt the aesthetics of the community.





