Town of Sand Lake
Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA)
April 15, 2021

The minutes, as follows, are intended to provide a general summary of the Agenda items and Public Hearings. Quotes presented are not verbatim, nor is all discussion which occurred presented herein. This document should not be relied upon as a transcript or the actual proceedings. The transcript of this meeting is on a digital voice recorder and available at the Town Hall.

CALL TO ORDER: Melissa Toni opened the meeting at 7:05 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Geraldine Burger
Scott Bendett
Amy Lent
Wayne Gendron

MEMBERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT: Kevin McGrath, Janet Reeves, Shane Cahill, Joseph & Melissa Jankovic, Valerie Balga, Andrew Bulmer, Sarah Campbell, Esq., Christopher Langlois, Esq, Monica Ryan (Town Planner)

RECORDING CLERK: Laura Fedoreshenko, Clerk for Planning Board and ZBA

Area Variance Application and Public Hearing

Thomas & Flora Fasoldt (applicant)
111 Wisner Road
Averill Park, NY 12018
RR– Rural/Residential District

Tax Map # 148.-1-25
Current Lot Size: 20.15 acres
Proposed Lot 1 Size: 9.7 +/- acres
Proposed Lot 2 Size: 3.34 +/- acres
Proposed Lot 3 Size: 7.11 +/- acres

An area variance application regarding a proposed subdivision to create a lot that exceeds the 3:1 ratio of lot depth to lot width.

Melissa Toni (MT) explained the Area Variance review and Public Hearing process for all attendees. Surveyor Kevin McGrath represented and summarized the project, which was initially presented at the March 11, 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) meeting. The survey map was viewed, and Mr. McGrath added that at the Planning Board meeting of March 3, 2021, an initial review of the Minor Subdivision application was performed, and a positive recommendation rendered for the requested area variance. With no questions from the Board members, MT motioned at 7:12pm to open the Public Hearing; seconded by Scott Bendett (SB) and all approved. Janet Reeves asked for clarification as to which of the proposed lots needed the area variance. The survey map was viewed, and Monica Ryan explained how proposed lot 3 would exceed the 3:1 lot depth to width ratio and thus needed an area variance. Ms. Reeves replied that she was okay with the proposal. With no written or further online comments received; MT motioned to close the public hearing at 7:13pm; seconded by Wayne Gendron (WG) and all approved.

MT stated that the Board members had several questions answered at the initial presentation. She added that while the ZBA tried to find an alternative option to alleviate the need for an area variance; no other option was feasible in order to subdivide. WG asked if Lot 2 would be going to a family member to which Mr. McGrath replied yes. WG then recalled that land adjacent to proposed Lot 3 did not want to be taken

as one lot and asked if that was due to the owners wanting to return for another minor subdivision in the future. Mr. McGrath replied that was a possibility as the applicant's had one other child who may want to build on it in the future. He further explained that the applicants wished to retain the property across the road, as part of Lot 1, at this time and the one son would build on proposed Lot 3. Mr. McGrath stated that the applicant's understood that should they wish to continue with a minor subdivision of Lot 1 in the future, they would need to return to the ZBA for insufficient lot width. Ms. Ryan clarified that proposed Lot 1 currently met the road frontage requirements as there was plenty of lot width on the opposing side of the road which was all part of Lot 1. MT asked if the Planning Board had any dialogue, comments, or special conditions upon their initial review. Ms. Ryan replied no, it was a straight recommendation with the understanding any future subdivision for proposed Lot 1 would need its own process.

MT motioned to classify the Area Variance as an Unlisted action under SEQR, declaring the Town of Sand Lake ZBA to be the Lead Agency; seconded by WG and all approved. MT made a motion to give this action a Negative Declaration under SEQR; seconded by WG and all approved.

MT stated the following criteria that ZBA members considered upon making the determination for this Area Variance Application.

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance.
   MT stated that she did not view the requested area variance as having an undesirable change. She added that it seemed to be a natural way to subdivide the property taking into consideration that the back of the land had an angle to it which partially caused the 4:1 lot depth to width ratio. MT also stated that while other such requests had alternatives, there was not one for this parcel due to severe angle at the back.
2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance.
   MT noted that the applicants wished to give a parcel of land to another child in the future and if the land adjacent to proposed Lot 3 was all one; that option would not exist.
3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial.
   MT stated that the requested Area Variance of a 4:1 lot depth to width ratio versus 3:1 was considered unsubstantial.
4. Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or district.
   MT stated she did not believe the request would have an adverse effect or impact as it was noted proposed Lot 3 would be for a single-family home on a large parcel. She added that the land was forested and field and that it did not seem that a large amount of impervious surface would be added.
5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the board of appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance.
   MT stated that, as with many of the requests before the ZBA, the difficulty was self-created.

MT motioned to approve the area variance for a 4:1 lot depth to width ratio versus the required 3:1 lot depth to width ratio for this project; seconded by Geraldine Burger (GB) and all approved.

Area Variance Application and Public Heraing

Shane Cahill (Applicant)
Glenn Kinney (Property Owner)
144 Methodist Farm Road
Averill Park, NY 12018
R-Residential Zoning District

Tax Map #: 170.2-1-16
Original Lot Size: 9.44 acres
Lot 1 Size: 2.73 acres
Lot 2 Size: 6.70 acres

An area variance application regarding a proposed subdivision to create a lot that exceeds the 3:1 lot depth to width ratio.

Realtor Shane Cahill represented and summarized the project that was initially presented at the March 11, 2021 ZBA meeting. With no questions from Board members, MT motioned to open the Public Hearing at 7:28pm; seconded by Amy Lent (AL) and all approved.

MT read the written public comment submitted by Elizabeth Cushing concerning Saxby Way, which is private, and asked how access would be gained to proposed Lot 1. MT stated that it was her understanding that the residents using Saxby Way had an easement. The survey map was reviewed and MT asked Mr. Cahill if that information was known. Mr. Cahill replied that the current owner accessed the property via Methodist Farm Road. He added that he was unsure if Saxby Way would be utilized; however, did not see it being used for proposed Lot 1 to have access. MT stated that the owner of Saxby Way would need to provide an easement for proposed Lot 1 to gain access by the lake; otherwise, it could not happen. Charles Zipprich offered to help explain the situation. He stated that the owner/applicant had a road on their property that was behind Saxby Way that circled around which is what the applicant utilized to gain access to the beach; thus, generally did not access through Saxby Way. MT stated that based on the information provided, it did not seem like an issue. AL asked if anyone thought that Ms. Cushing's concern was how the newer owners for proposed Lot 1 would reach the lake. Ms. Ryan stated that a private easement could be given for Saxby Way. Mr. Cahill replied that he did not believe that there was any intention to access it via Saxby Way by vehicular or on foot. WG stated that the ZBA could not put a stipulation on private property should the owner wish to grant an easement.

With Mr. Zipprich's permission, MT then read the letter from him concerning access, maintenance and drainage adjacent to Saxby Way. MT asked Mr. Zipprich if he was aware of how an easement would be granted for Saxby Way. Mr. Zipprich stated he was not 100% sure and added that as he viewed the plot plan, it seemed that access would be from Methodist Farm Road versus Saxby Way. MT agreed and added that to use Saxby Way would mostly likely have to put a driveway in front of the house and thought folks would rather have the house closer to the water. She then referred to the drainage concern due to higher elevation and asked Mr. Zipprich to explain. Mr. Zipprich replied that he had experienced in the past on a different property that had higher elevation behind him and when developed his area had turned into a wetland and was trying to avoid that from happening again. MT asked Mr. Cahill for information on the proposed location for construction access and the house. Mr. Cahill replied that the area variance was needed for the minor subdivision and was not tied into any immediate or near future construction plans. MT agreed and clarified that the ZBA did not have any jurisdiction on where those items were placed however would help if known. Mr. Cahill stated that he was not aware of that information as he was not the intended owner, and the future owner would need to comply with the Building/Zoning codes and address any construction/design issues. AL asked if proposed Lot 1 was sold or had a buyer to which Mr. Cahill replied it was not currently under contract. MT stated that the concerned owners on Saxby Way seemed far away from the proposed Lot 1 regarding any potential drainage issues. Mr. Zipprich replied he had less of a concern after viewing the plot plan. MT stated that she was not aware of anything the ZBA could do in terms of the access concern on Saxby Way as it was out of their jurisdiction to which Ms.

Ryan agreed. With no further written public or online comments, MT motioned to close the Public Hearing at 7:43pm; seconded by WG and all approved.

MT motioned to classify the Area Variance as an Unlisted action under SEQR, declaring the Town of Sand Lake ZBA to be the Lead Agency; seconded by WG and all approved. MT made a motion to give this action a Negative Declaration under SEQR; seconded by WG and all approved.

MT stated the following criteria that ZBA members considered upon making the determination for this Area Variance Application.

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance.
   MT stated that this was like the previous application and did not view the requested area variance as an undesirable change. MT also stated that the requested area variance of a 3.25:1 lot depth to width ratio versus the required 3:1 ratio was even smaller and only missed meeting the zoning code by approximately 20+ feet. She added that the public's concerns were either clarified, satisfied or outside of the ZBA's jurisdiction.
2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance.
   MT noted that due to the existing house structure on Lot 2, another alternative did not exist. She added that shifting the property line closer to the existing structure on Lot 2 would result in the need for a different area variance and this was the more desirable one.
3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial.
   MT stated that the requested Area Variance of 3.25 lot depth to width was barely over the required 3:1 ratio and as such considered unsubstantial.
4. Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or district.
   MT stated she did not believe the request would have an adverse effect or impact as it was noted proposed Lot 1 would be for a single-family home on a lot that was above the minimum size required. She added that it was highly unlikely that there would be environmental conditions.
5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the board of appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance.
   MT stated that, as with many of the requests before the ZBA, the difficulty was self-created.

MT motioned to approve the area variance for a 3.25 lot depth to width ratio versus the required 3:1 lot depth to width ratio for this project; seconded by SB and all approved.

Planning Board Request for Interpretation on Special Use Permit Definition

Joseph Jankovic (applicant & property owner) **Tax Map # 159.-1-2.12**
Eastern Union Turnpike
Averill Park, NY 12018 Lot Size: 23.13 acres
R – Residential Zoning District

A Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review Application to utilize basketball courts for personal use and by a non-profit organization.

Attorney Christopher Langlois had been appointed to represent the Town of Sand Lake ZBA on this issue as it was a conflict of interest for the Town's ZBA attorney, Craig Crist, to do so because of representing both Boards. Mr. Langlois explained that in the course of considering a Special Use Permit (SUP) application filed by Mr. Jankovic, the Planning Board (PB), at their April 7, 2021 meeting, stumbled onto a question as to what the proper use category was for the proposed use. He further stated that the PB questioned whether the proposed use qualified as a recreation, open-space use under the Zoning Code, which would be permitted with the SUP issued by the PB; or, whether it constituted a recreation, club use which would not be permitted in the residential district. Mr. Langlois further stated that he understood that the PB then adopted a motion referring the question to the ZBA to issue an interpretation on their Zoning Code question for proposed use. Mr. Langlois stated that an initial issue that needed to be addressed was whether the ZBA at this point had jurisdiction to issue the interpretation as requested by the PB. He explained that the ZBA's powers were outlined in the Town Law Section 267A which stated that the ZBA had appellate jurisdiction only which meant that they could only answer questions that came to them on an appeal taken from an initial determination by, in this case, the Code Enforcement Officer Michael Wager; thus, was this request in front of the ZBA because there was a determination made by Mr. Wager and if so, was the appeal made within the request timeframe of 60 days of the determination. Mr. Langlois stated that, as far as he was aware, Mr. Wager had not been asked to issue a formal initial interpretation of the question; thus, was unsure if it should be in front of the ZBA at this time. He then stated that the ZBA would first have to decide if they had jurisdiction at this point to hear the request and if concluded that they did not, the proper course would probably be to adopt a resolution indicating that the ZBA did not have jurisdiction at this point and refer it back to the PB to request a formal determination by Mr. Wager. He further added that at that point, if any party was unhappy with the determination, they could then appeal to the ZBA for it to be properly reviewed. MT asked if it was correct that there was not a formal appeal presented at this time. Mr. Langlois replied that was his understanding and added that the person who has the initial issuance of the interpretation is the Code Enforcement Officer (CEO). He explained that if no one had an issue with Mr. Wager's determination, that would be the end of it. He further explained that if someone were not satisfied with that determination, which could include "someone" from the PB, they would be entitled to file an appeal from the CEO's administrative determination to the ZBA and it would be timely if done within the 60 days from when the determination was issued and filed with the Clerk. He concluded that for the issue to be in front of the ZBA, there would need to be an appeal filed and he did not believe such an appeal had been filed to this point. GB agreed that the ZBA did not have an appeal in front of them; thus, until a decision was made on the status, she did not see how the ZBA could move forward at this time. Ms. Jankovic commented that they had been confused by being referred to the ZBA and asked if they would be able to utilize the basketball courts in some capacity while the situation was being figured out. MT replied that she agreed in that she did not see how the ZBA could have jurisdiction at this time. Ms. Ryan explained that at the PB meeting the question on classification of use had come up and whether it constituted a determination. She further explained that a letter had gone to the applicants regarding the need for a Special Use Permit; however, it was not a determination letter, per say, so a formal determination had not been made. She stated that it would be up to the ZBA to decide if the formal determination letter was needed. MT commented that, once that was done, then someone would need to appeal the determination letter. Mr. Langlois agreed and added that the "someone" could be the PB, the applicant or a neighbor. Ms. Ryan stated that at the April 7, 2021 PB meeting, it was anticipated the situation cited could be the case and as such, the PB motioned for a formal determination on classification of use be sought from Michael Wager. She added that the PB's requested motion would move forward if the ZBA decided it had no jurisdiction of the appeal at this time. MT made a motion that the ZBA did not have jurisdiction regarding the PB's request for an interpretation of law due to no formal determination appealed; seconded by WG and all approved. Ms. Jankovic then asked what the possibility was for using the courts in the meantime. Ms. Ryan replied that she would advise Michael Wager of their inquiry.

Area Variance Application

Sharon Hogle Guthier and
Susan Hogle Rowlands-Clemens (Applicants)
60 1st Dyke Road
Averill Park, NY 12018
R-Residential Zoning District

Tax Map #: 158.-3-6.11
Original Lot Size: 5.47 acres

An area variance application regarding insufficient lot width/frontage as related to a proposed boundary line adjustment.

Surveyor Kevin McGrath presented and stated that the layout of the current lots was unusual. Mr. McGrath explained that Hogles owned about 31+ acres on 1st Dyke Road. The survey map was viewed, and he stated that there was an original farmhouse in the lower right-hand corner - Tax Map # 158.-3-6.3 which consisted of .8 acres of land. Mr. McGrath added that the remaining property was over 30 acres; thus, the owners wanted to rearrange the property to place the bulk of property with the original family farmhouse and the parcel with Tax Map 158.-3-6.11 would end up 5.47 acres. He added that the 5.47-acre parcel had an existing driveway, and the plan was for the grandson to build a home on that property. It was explained that the reason for the area variance request was due to the loss of road frontage for the proposed boundary line adjustment. Mr. McGrath agreed and stated it would only have 44.5' of road frontage as that was all the frontage in this vicinity on the westerly part of the property. He explained that the remaining property had 250' of frontage with the house and another driveway access with 60' of frontage. He added that that the only option the applicant would have is to add that 60' of frontage, mentioned above; however, that would block the access to the bulk of the property and still not bring the road frontage up to what was required by code. He concluded that this action would not create another lot but rather just rearrange a boundary line between two existing parcels. Additional documentation was viewed, and Ms. Ryan explained that the lot did not have the correct amount of frontage to start (108') and the proposed project would make it more non-conforming which is why the variance was needed at this time. MT asked what the surrounding area consisted of. Mr. McGrath stated that the Ketzer's resided to the west and the other piece to the right was owned by the Link Family Trust for which the Hogle family was in the process of purchasing that property and may possibly be dissolved into the 5.47-acre lot for more frontage or reduced to add more frontage. WG noted that he was familiar with the area due to having done some work there and stated that the neighbors voiced to him their support of the proposed boundary line adjustment. WG motioned to deem the application as complete and scheduled the Public Hearing for May 13, 2021 at 7:00pm; seconded by MT and all approved. Mr. Clemens stated he was to be the future property owner for this project and welcomed Board members to perform a site visit.

Area Variance Application

Valerie Balga (Applicant)
1202 Burden Lake Road
Averill Park, NY 12018
R-Residential Zoning District

Tax Map #: 158.4-5-24
Original Lot Size: .17 acres

An area variance application regarding insufficient front and side yard setbacks as related to a scenic preservation application for a proposed accessory structure within 100' of Burden Lake.

Valerie Balga presented and stated that she wished to add a 10' x 10' manufactured gazebo to the lake side of the yard which would be installed by a licensed contractor. Site plan and pictures were viewed, and Ms. Balga added that the deck would be expanded to meet up with the gazebo. MT stated that the applicant sought a side yard setback of 5' versus the required 10' to which Ms. Balga agreed. MT asked if

the request was due to wanting the gazebo closer to the water to which Ms. Balga stated was correct. Ms. Balga added the gazebo would be partially in the water by a couple of feet which is why she had received a permit from DEC. MT asked if it would be on piers or filled to which Ms. Balga replied both and the side by the water would be stabilized by piers. GB stated that she felt all the information needed had been submitted. SB added that it looked complete to which MT agreed. MT asked for an explanation of why it could not be placed 10' back. Ms. Balga replied that 10' back would place the gazebo almost in her living room and whole idea was to have it lakeside. WG asked if the two proposed Techno metal posts were being placed in the lake to which Ms. Balga replied yes. WG then asked how the hydro equipment would be utilized to place those posts in the water as he could not picture that done based on the layout of the site. Ms. Balga's builder replied that the Techno post company would set those posts and added that company had done this type of work frequently and never had an issue. He also stated that company would be onsite with the builder over the next couple of days to view the area; however, based on pictures and drawings sent to the company, they did not indicate there would be any issues. WG motioned to deem the application as complete and scheduled the Public Hearing for May 13, 2021 at 7:00pm; seconded by MT and all approved. MT stated that a site visit may be needed, and arrangements were made with the applicant for Board members to visit individually. MT motioned that a Recommendation be sought from the Planning Board as the project was right on the water and as such would also require Scenic Preservation Review to be completed by them. WG seconded the motion and all approved.

Area Variance Application

Andrew & Moira Bulmer (Applicant)
24 Stone Camp Way
Averill Park, NY
R-Residential Zoning District

Tax Map #: 170.2-1-4
Lot Size: 1.84 acres

An area variance application regarding insufficient front and side yard setbacks.

Andrew Bulmer and attorney Sarah Campbell were present. MT noted that the Bulmer's had been before the ZBA previously for Area Variances on this parcel. Ms. Campbell stated that she represented the Bulmer's and agreed with MT's statement. Ms. Campbell added that the Bulmer's had applied for the initial Area Variances prior to purchasing the vacant lot to build a 1,560 square foot home and their plan had not changed. She added that at the time the initial area variances were sought, there had not be a survey; thus, measurements were taken via a tax map. Ms. Campbell stated that the plans had been submitted to the Planning Board (PB) for the Scenic Preservation Application and reiterated that those plans had not changed. She explained due to COVID, the Bulmer's ended up with three different contractors to handle excavation, footings and foundation walls and a mistake had been made. A picture of the property was viewed, and Ms. Campbell stated that on the west property line the variance relief granted was to 10.7' and the actual foundation at the very corner was 6.3' which was realized when the survey had been prepared. She added that the Bulmer's were aware of the error and were seeking variance relief to correct it. Ms. Campbell further stated that now with the survey having been done, there are now exact measurements for all the property lines. She detailed that on the lakeside, a variance had been granted for 30' and there was now 35' from the lake; however, the other two property lines were an issue. She explained that on the east side, the requirement was 30' and no relief had been previously granted. She added that the property itself was 30.9' from the foundation; however, the plans that had been submitted showed a roofed porch. Ms. Campbell stated the applicant, since that time, had become aware that any part of the structure which contained a roof counted towards the setbacks; thus, the screened-in porch to the property line was 18.9' and therefore a variance was also being sought for it. Ms. Campbell stated that the final variance being sought was for the front yard setback which had a measurement of 18.8' and no prior variance relief had been required for the location as it was believed that there would be enough room. She added that variance relief was now being sought for the front

yard setback. Ms. Ryan clarified that the front yard setback had required a variance in the applicant's original application as 50' was the requirement and the Bulmer's sought 25' which had been granted. Ms. Campbell stated that to avoid the requested 18.8' front yard setback the proposed home would need to be moved closer to the water. Ms. Campbell then wanted to clarify that in the west side yard setback where the foundation had been mis-poured, the request was for a 6.3' variance from 10.7' which had been previously granted; however, she was unsure if the proposed bowed window would affect those numbers. MT replied that all the setbacks were measured from the roofline of the building and as such, the proposed bowed window would need to comply with the setback granted. Ms. Campbell replied that the variance sought for that area would then be 3.4' versus 6.3' which was to the foundation. WG clarified that the structure is measured from the roofline which would extend out past the bowed window and would result in less than 3.4'. Ms. Campbell asked Mr. Bulmer to advise on what the exact measurement would be to the roofline. Mr. Bulmer replied that would add an additional 12". WG stated the additional 12' would now be 2.4' from the property line versus 3.4' for that side yard setback. Ms. Campbell added that the applicants also proposed additional substantial landscaping along that property line. MT asked if the foundation had now been surveyed to which Ms. Campbell replied yes. MT then asked if the measurements listed on the drawing were exact to which Ms. Campbell replied yes. MT then asked if the entire proposed structure could be added to the latest drawing along with the setbacks discussed to which Ms. Campbell replied that they would try. WG asked if the application could be deemed complete and schedule the public hearing. Ms. Ryan replied that while the Town Planning attorney was absent from the meeting, he would advise that the application could not be deemed complete as the exact variances were still not known until the surveyor provided those and therefore a public hearing should not be scheduled until such time as all requested documentation was received. Ms. Ryan added that those documents were necessary for the public to view should they wished to do so. WG replied that he understood. Mr. Bulmer submitted, via online, additional information during the meeting. The additional information was viewed and WG noted that the dimension for the roofline of the structure was not reflected. WG asked about the deck facing the water to which Ms. Campbell replied that it would be open; thus, understood it did not count in the setback measure. Ms. Ryan agreed with Ms. Campbell. MT asked about the distance to the lake to which Ms. Campbell replied 35'. Ms. Ryan then asked about the roofed porch and pointed out the closest line which would be at 18.9' for the setback and Ms. Campbell agreed. Ms. Campbell added that the unroofed deck facing the water was proposed at 12' wide. Ms. Ryan clarified that the original application presented to the ZBA reflected the 38' x 40' footprint and that it had not included the deck, front roofed porch or screened in porch on the side. She added that in March of the next year, the PB had seen an elevation drawing that included a photo rendering of a building which showed a deck; however, there had not been any footprint provided to either Board that included any of the other areas. MT stated that while the latest information was helpful, it was missing a few items before the application could be deemed complete and a public hearing scheduled. MT then asked that the following items be added to the latest plan information: distance from the deck to the water, distance from the side yard corner of the proposed roofed screened-in porch to the property line and the other side yard setback that now seemed to be 2.4' versus 3.4' with the proposed bowed window. Ms. Campbell indicated she did not see a problem with the requested information being added to the plan. Per an inquiry from Ms. Campbell, a discussion ensued regarding the feasibility to deem the application complete prior to the May ZBA meeting in order that the public hearing could be scheduled. The Board members agreed that with the absence of Town Planner attorney at the meeting to provide different direction, they were not comfortable in deeming the application complete prior to the May 13th meeting and as such, a public hearing could not be scheduled. Ms. Campbell agreed to return to the ZBA on May 13th with the requested information added to the site plan.

DRAFT RESOLUTION APPROVALS

Adoption of Negative Declaration for Christopher and Mari Wachtel
MT motioned to waive the full reading of the Negative Declaration; seconded by AL and all approved.
MT motioned to approve the Negative Declaration in its entirety; seconded by AL and all approved.

Area Variance Application for Christopher and Mari Wachtel
MT motioned to waive the full reading of the draft Resolution; seconded by SB and all approved.
MT motioned to approve the Resolution in its entirety; seconded by GB and all approved.

Area Variance Application for Maureen Straight
MT motioned to waive the full reading of the draft Resolution; seconded by AL and all approved.
MT motioned to approve the Resolution in its entirety; seconded by GB and all approved.

DRAFT MINUTES FOR APPROVAL
MT motioned to accept the March 11, 2021 minutes as submitted, seconded by AL and all approved.

ADJOURMENT - MT motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:00pm; seconded by GB and all approved.