

**VILLAGE OF FLORIDA
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 21, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Scott called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM with a Pledge of Allegiance.

MEMBER'S PRESENT:

Chairman Robert Scott
Member Howard Cohen
Member Craig Garbowski
Member Marvin Kissinger
Member Jim Sosler
Alt. Member Diane Puglisi

PROFESSIONAL'S PRESENT:

Penny Schlagel, Secretary
Sean Hoffman, Eng.
Elizabeth Cassidy, Attorney
Matt Roach, Trustee

PUBLIC HEARING: Brach Realty
12 Roosevelt Ave
Site Plan Amendment

POSTPONED UNTIL FEBRUARY 18, 2025

Discussion with regard to the applicant obtaining their Property List, and Secretary Schlagel stated that she does not provide the applicant with the Property List, however, has helped previous applicants obtain such list and answered any concerns that they had.

APPLICATIONS:

1. Brach Realty
12 Roosevelt Ave **POSTPONED UNTIL FEBRUARY 18, 2025**
Site Plan Amendment
SBL: 112-1-9.2

2. Lempka Warehouse
SBL: 120-1-2&3

Present on behalf of this application: Rose Winglovitz, Eng.
Eric Muhlrاد, Applicant

Eng. Winglovitz approached the board and stated that he has reviewed Eng. Hoffman and Atty. Cassidy's comments. (See Attached) Also, wanted the board to know that the applicant is working with the NYSDEC to determine the process under the new wetlands law and will prepare a Phase II Study as required by SHPO.

Discussion was then had by the members with regard to architectural drawings, they have not seen any.

Member Sosler asked if the new building would fit in to the existing building exterior.

Eng. Ross stated that he would provide renderings.

Member Grabowski stated that he would like to a visual of what it would look like from 17A.

Eng. Ross asked is we could see first what the DEC says, as this will cost about \$10,000.00.

Discussion ensued about the new Wetlands Law, and all agreed that they will not know how it will affect this application.

Atty. Cassidy then reviewed her comment letter of January 21, 2025. (See Attached) She did request for the applicant to submit an Agricultural Data Statement (if required) and to modify the narrative describing the warrant for a left turn lane at Reme Plaza. (See Attached)

Discussion ensued about the left turn lane at Reme Plaza and DOT requirements.

Member Kissinger felt that ultimately, the DOT will be making this decision.

Member Cohen moved a motion declaring Lead Agency with regard to the Lempka Warehouse (SBL: 120-1-2&3) Project. Seconded by Member Sosler.

On roll call, all voted yes and Chairman Scott declared this Resolution adopted.

3. Sign Permit Application
42 No. Main St. Suite #3
Saje Rose (Home Decorating)

Present on behalf of the Application: Dejci Jones-Aravjo.

This matter is before the board for ARB approval.

Atty. Cassidy then reviewed the ARB standards with the board.

Village of Florida

119-38

“(6) Standards. In reviewing the plan, the Board shall give consideration to:

- a. The architectural value and significance of the structure and its relationship to the surrounding area.
- b. The general appropriateness of the exterior design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.
- c. Where new construction, alterations, repairs or additions are undertaken, they shall be consistent with the architectural style of existing buildings or the architectural style of the surrounding area, if deemed appropriate by the Planning Board. The Planning Board shall specifically consider whether on-site or adjacent buildings are historic, and whether the above shall be consistent with same.
- d. Excessive dissimilarity or inappropriateness in relation to any other structure, existing or for which a permit has been issued, in respect to one or more of the following features: cubical content, gross floor area, building area or height of roof or other significant design features, such as materials or style or architectural design.

- e. Excessive similarity to any other structure existing, or for which a permit has been issued, in respect to one or more of the following features of exterior design and appearance: apparently identical front, side or other elevations visible from the street, substantially identical size and arrangement of either doors, window, porticoes or other openings or breaks in the elevation facing the street, including reverse arrangement; or other significant identical features of design, such as, but not limited to, material, roof line, height or other design elements.
- f. New structures should be constructed to a height visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which they are visually related.
- g. The gross volume of a new structure should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which it is visually related.
- h. In the elevations of a building, the proportion between the width and height in the facades should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which they are visually related.
- i. The proportions and relationships between doors and windows in the facades should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which they are visually related.
- j. The rhythm of solids to voids, created by window, door and other openings in the façade, should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which it is visually related.
- k. The existing rhythm created by existing building masses and spaces between them should be preserved, insofar as practicable.
- l. The materials and texture used in the facades should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which it is visually related.
- m. The design of the roof should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which it is visually related.
- n. The landscape plan should be sensitive to the individual building and to its occupants and their needs. Further, the landscape treatment should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which it is visually related.
- o. Architectural details should be incorporated as necessary to relate the new with the old and to preserve and enhance the inherent characteristics of the area.

- p. The setback of the buildings from the street or property line and the other yard setbacks should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment to which they are visually related.

Ms. Aravjo stated that the sign will be located on the building like the one directly next door at the hair salon.

Atty. Cassidy requested that Ms. Aravjo send the Building Inspector the exact signed (red Lettering) that will be installed. If there is any change in size, it will have to be approved by the Building Inspector.

Also, Atty. Cassidy stated that no public hearing is required since this is a Type II action.

Member Cohen moved a motion authorizing ARB Approval for Deja Rose (size 24 x 24) at 42 No. Main St., Suite 3. Seconded by Member Sosler.

On roll call, all voted yes and Chairman Scott declared this resolution carried.

NEW/UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Sign Application (Continued)
22 Meadow Road
Ltr. Dated December 18, 2024

Applicant: Nesly Munoz and Nathan Hoyt

Atty. Cassidy stated with regard to the December 18, 2024 letter from the applicant, she is concerned with the material it is made out of, as well as the size, as it is a tarp material.

Member Garbowski stated that this type of banner is just temporary.

Discussion ensued about the material making of the sign and its life expectancy.

Atty. Cassidy stated that unfortunately, the sign went up before approval was actually given.

Discussion ensued with regard to the code (119-18).

It was then concluded by all members that they would like an interpretation from the Building Inspector with regard to the window signs based upon the entire buildings.

Mr. Hoyt expressed his concern in the investment of a sign.

Eng. Hoffman along with Atty. Cassidy expressed again that the applicant should read the code (119-18)

Eng. Hoffman stated that he would be more than happy to help the Building Inspector reviewing the code.

Atty. Cassidy stated that unfortunately the sign went up before approval was given.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

Since no one from the public entered any discussion, Chairman Scott closed this portion of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Member Sosler moved for the adjournment of this meeting. Seconded by Member Cohen at 8:50 PM.

On roll call, all voted yes and Chairman Scott declared the meeting adjourned.

Penny Schlagel, Secretary

