
III. K – MISCELLANEOUS

K-1 Comment:

Yeah, I'll start with from the time I came back to this Board, I've been asking for a full copy of the DEIS, repeatedly, in writing, on the telephone. I finally went over and I said I will come over to get one, and what I got was about, oh, looks like about three quarters – half inch of paper, but it doesn't include all of the pertinent information and the schedules and everything. I have not read them. I was told that I could access them. There are thousands of pages of them. I don't have the ability. I couldn't pull it off the system. I need it. I want a copy, and I brought that up at the last meeting and I said I wanted it so that I can review it because the tables usually have a lot to do with this. So, obviously, my preference would be, and I certainly repeat my request. If I'm -- that's not gonna be the basis for my vote because I don't want to be unfair to anybody but I need to see it and I would hope that we would stay open particularly since there are two members not here.
(Board Member Neufeld, Public Hearing, April 1, 2021)

K-1 Response:

Full hard copies of the DEIS and Appendix were submitted to the Village for each Board member, and an electronic digital copy was also provided, in full accordance with the Village's submission requirements.

K-2 Comment:

And my final comment is really on the overall. When you first -- when this was first coming to the Board, we made it very clear to the applicant that all of the board members needed hard copies, and so we were each given two volumes. One had all of the appendices, and one had the material itself. Subsequent to that, and this is not the applicant's fault, I certainly asked the Village planner whether or not we needed to keep all of that and they said no, we would be getting complete new information and I threw out -- actually, I recycled all of the paper because there was an awful lot of paper and used it for all of my home printing during the COVID era. We never got a complete. You kept sending us piecemeal pieces, and as Dave points out, we got some of them in hard copy. We didn't get the rest. I do not believe it is acceptable for you to have done it only on line. I think that is an unacceptable way to submit it. I think it is impossible for people on their home screens to sit on my screen, what is it, thirteen inches? Very difficult to read anything nor am I gonna print it out on my own computer. I think the applicant should have provided a complete new copy of everything. It was so clear to the applicant that this had to be hard copy. I will tell you that when it is time for your final EIS you must provide an entire hard copy for every single board member and make sure that they get it.
(Chairwomen Kramer, Public Hearing, April 1, 2021)

K-2 Response:

No piecemeal submissions were ever made to the Village. Full and complete hard copies were submitted for the completeness review as well as the final "complete" version of the DEIS.

K-3 Comment:

Yes, just along the lines of segmentation. I think it would help this board if someone wanted to request that the applicant provide and maybe with the assistance from Amber the full administrative record from the prior approval including the original application, withdraw of the application, Chair, that you had just mentioned, as well as an any meeting minutes and approvals so that this board can properly assess what had happened historically versus what is happening now.
(Mr. Gottlieb, Public Hearing, May 6, 2021)

K-3 Response:

The following materials have been provided to the Village:

- documentation from the 1st application which was withdrawn for consideration in March of 2009
- hard copy of the approval plans plus C of O for the current Mamaroneck Self Storage facility.

Please note that a FOIL request was submitted to the Village of Mamaroneck for the “full administrative record from the prior approval”, however, in correspondence received from Agostino Fusco, Clerk-Treasurer of the Village of Mamaroneck dated June 14, 2021, the Applicant was told that the FOIL request might not be fulfilled until December of 2021, and perhaps not at all.

Procedural history of self-storage applications at the Project Site prior to the pending application:

In or about 2009, the Applicant filed an application with the Planning Board seeking to construct an approximately 88,000-square foot, 578-unit self-storage facility along with a 6,400-square foot cabinet-making shop with a total of 29 parking spaces on-site.¹ The proposed action required site plan approval and a floodplain development permit from the Planning Board, several area variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”), a determination that the project was consistent with the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program by the Village Harbor Coastal Zone Management Commission (“HCZMC”) and approval from the Architectural Review Board. The Planning Board initially declared its intent to serve as Lead Agency under SEQRA, however the ZBA objected and ultimately assumed Lead Agency status on March 4, 2010. The ZBA issued a positive declaration under SEQRA for the project, citing concerns relating to traffic, flooding and proposed building size. At that time, due to the significant costs associated with pursuing the project that had been declared to have the potential to have one or more significant adverse environmental impacts, the Applicant withdrew its application. The ZBA did not “turn the application down” or reject the proposal.

On approximately October 10, 2012, the Applicant submitted a new application for site plan approval seeking to redevelop the Property and construct the current self-storage facility that exists on the Premises today. This application proposed a 40,620-square foot self-storage facility, as opposed to the 88,000 self-storage facility proposed in 2009. Under the 2012 proposal, many of the then existing uses at the facility were proposed to remain. The Planning Board assumed Lead Agency Status on November 14, 2012 and on January 30, 2013, the Planning Board issued a negative declaration finding that the project would not have the potential for one or more adverse environmental impacts.

On approximately October 3, 2013, the ZBA granted the Applicant several variances for the now existing self-storage facility on the Property. Following receipt of these variances, the Applicant proceeded to obtain a consistency determination from the HCZMC, site plan approval and a flood development permit from the Planning Board and approval from the Architectural Review Board. The Applicant then constructed the existing 40,492-square foot self-storage building, completed towards the end of 2015, that exists on the Site today.

K-4 Comment:

Error in III.K.2, which indicates that the application was withdrawn, when it was “pos-dec’d.”
(Chairman Neufeld, November 16, 2021 Work Session)

K-4 Response:

Please see the procedural history of the self-storage application as presented in response K-3.

K-5 Comment:

Do we have a topographic survey?
(Chairman Neufeld, November 16, 2021 Work Session)

K-5 Response:

The topographic survey has been part of all prior site plan submissions, and is included in the full size plan set accompanying this submission.

K-6 Comment:

Can we have a copy of the site plan approval for the existing building?

¹ See June 20, 2018 submission to the ZBA for a comprehensive procedural history of prior self-storage proposals on the Site.

(Chairman Neufeld, November 16, 2021 Work Session)

K-6

Response:

Copies of the approved site plan and Certificate of Occupancy are included ~~with this submission~~ in Appendix C.