



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES (FINAL)

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 2016

7:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

CALL TO ORDER: Bill Moore, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG:

PRESENT: Bill Moore, Chairman; Adam McNeill, Secretary; Gary Hasbrouck; Skip Carlson; James Helicke; Susan Steer; Oksana Ludd, alternate

ABSENT: Keith Kaplan, Vice Chairman

STAFF: Susan Barden, Senior Planner, City of Saratoga Springs
Tony Izzo, Assistant City Attorney

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECORDING OF PROCEEDING:

The proceedings of this meeting are being recorded for the benefit of the secretary. Because the minutes are not a verbatim record of the proceedings, the minutes are not a word-for-word transcript of the recording.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADJOURNED APPLICATIONS:

#2882 BEYER SUBDIVISION, 199 West Circular Street, area variance to provide for a two-lot residential subdivision; seeking relief from the minimum lot area requirement in the Urban Residential-2 District.
Application adjourned to May 9, 2016.

#2880 ARMER/DESORBO RESIDENCE, 117 Middle Avenue, area variance for additions to an existing single-family residence; seeking relief from the minimum side yard setback and minimum rear yard setback requirements in the Urban Residential-3 District. Application adjourned to May 9, 2016.

#2887 DOWNTON WALK APPEAL, 27 Jumel Place, interpretation of determination of the Zoning and Building Inspector for proposed construction of seven single-family residences (condominiums) in the Urban Residential-3 District.

#2856 MOORE HALL, 28 Union Avenue/35 White Street, area variance for proposed demolition of an existing Dormitory building and construction of 26 dwelling units in an Urban Residential-4 District.

#2856 MOORE HALL, 28 Union Avenue/35 White Street, area variance to convert the existing building to a 53 unit Apartment building; seeking relief from the minimum lot size and minimum parking requirement in the Urban Residential-4 District.

#2759.1 ANW HOLDINGS RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, 27 Jumel Place, area variance to demolish existing structure and build seven-unit condominium project; seeking relief from the maximum principal building coverage, minimum front yard setback and maximum height for a residential fence requirement in the Urban Residential-3 District.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **#2889 CDJT DEVELOPMENT MULTI-FAMILY,** 124 Jefferson Street, use variance to convert an existing 6-unit senior housing development to multi-family residential including workforce housing; seeking relief from the permitted uses in the Urban Residential-2 District.

SEORA:

Action appears to be a Type I action. A short EAF was submitted.

PARCEL HISTORY:

- City Council failed to consider the petition for a zoning map amendment from UR-2 to UR-4A, May 15, 2012.
- Planning Board unfavorable advisory opinion issued to the City Council for the proposed zoning map amendment, April 25, 2012.
- Special Use Permit for up to six senior housing units issued January 13, 2005.
- Site plan approval granted May 12, 2010.

USE VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS:

- UR-2 permits single-family residences.
- UR-2 permits principal permitted uses/structures by issuance of a special use permit and site plan review. – private schools, religious institutions, neighborhood B&B, neighborhood rooming house, senior housing, and senior assisted care facility, cemeteries.
- The maximum density would be two single-family residences on the property.
- Two of the units would be market rate.
- The applicant is requesting a use variance for multi-family with the public benefit of providing workforce housing for four of the units.
- The request is 80% to 120% AMI – AMI in our area for 2015 was \$82,700 for family of four. Range would be to sell units to those with annual income of \$66,160 to \$99,240.

NOTIFICATIONS/APPROVALS/CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- Planning Board site plan review is required.
- Area variances from minimum parking requirement – 12 parking spaces required – 2 per unit for residences –was 1 per unit for senior housing.

NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT:

- Email correspondence from Aimee Miller, 121 Madison Street from staff.

Agents: Paul Glotzhzker, property manager for the Touhey Family; Danielle Worrington, real estate agent

The property was acquired in 2010. We try to help develop underdeveloped areas. Mr. Glotzhzker reviewed the use variance considerations. We feel there is a need for workforce housing in the City of Saratoga Springs. We would like to take two units for standard units of housing. 4 units are requested for workforce housing.

Adam McNeill, Secretary requested details from the applicant concerning the annual maintenance expenses. This application is fairly complicated and we encourage the applicant to touch base with staff, Susan Barden. Additional information is to be provided to the Board via staff and prior to the return of the applicant before this Board.

Ms. Worrington provided information on the advertising and marketing of this property.

Adam McNeill, Secretary stated we will need documentation for everything you listed before, where it was marketed, as well as copies of the MLS listings and any advertising or marketing documentation. We need anything and everything to prove financial hardship. All this information is necessary for a use variance.

Discussion ensued regarding the additional information the Board has requested.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bill Moore, Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:55 P.M.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

None heard.

Bill Moore, Chairman stated the public hearing will remain open. The applicant has had information requested of them. They will return before the Board once all pertinent information has been submitted.

2. **#2886 HOLTBY PROPERTY**, 35 Bensonhurst Avenue, area variance to create a single-family residential lot; seeking relief from the minimum lot size and minimum average lot width requirements in the Urban Residential-2 District.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be a Type II action and therefore exempt from further SEQRA review.

AREA VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS:

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	TOTAL RELIEF REQUESTED
Minimum average lot width	60 feet	45 feet	15 feet (25%)
Minimum lot size	6,600 sq. ft.	5,400 sq. ft.	1,200 sq. ft. (18%)

Applicant: Todd Levinson, Rejuvenation Homes

Mr. Levinson stated there are two lots each with their own tax numbers. On one lot a home currently exists, the other lot is fairly vacant housing a garage which overlaps on the property line, which will be demolished. We are hoping to build a single family home on the vacant lot and then we will address the second property. Many of the lots in the neighborhood are 50 ft. wide and are 6,000 square feet. The lot is similar in both width and square footage to all of the immediate surrounding lots. The current lot size cannot be expanded due to the fact that there is an existing building located to the south that is at the minimum setback for its lot. The lot to the north is already below the minimum width for the zoning district and narrowing this lot to enhance the width of the lot would only further exaggerate its non compliance. The lot to the west is below the minimum area for the zoning district and shortening the lot to enhance the subject lot would only further exaggerate its non-compliance. The subject lot is also in character with the lots immediately surrounding it all of which are similar in width and square footage. Municipal water and sewer are available to this lot. A new driveway to the lot is proposed and relocating the driveway to the adjoining lot is likely.

Gary Hasbrouck requested a copy of the tax maps identifying the approximate widths and areas of lots in the neighborhood, as well as a copy of the survey to be provided to the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bill Moore, Chairman opened the public hearing at 8:13 P.M.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

None heard.

Bill Moore, Chairman stated the public hearing will remain open. A resolution will be prepared and presented at the next ZBA Meeting scheduled for May 9, 2016.

3. **#2888 SARATOGA AUTO REPAIR SIGN**, 254 Washington Street, area variance for a freestanding sign; seeking relief from the maximum height requirement for such sign in the Transect-5 District.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be a Type II action, and therefore exempt from further SEQRA review.

AREA VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS:

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	TOTAL RELIEF REQUESTED
Maximum height freestanding sign	12 ft.	15 ft.	3 ft. (25%)

Agent: Brian Wilhoite, owner Saratoga Auto Repair, LLC

Mr. Wilhoite stated he is not requesting a change from the height and dimensions of the current sign on the property. It has been here for 30+ years. Mr. Wilhoite is interested in making a change with the addition of his logo only. Alternatives are not feasible due to the expense of creating a new post and sign. Washington Street (Rt. 29) is a designated city gateway. The signage is not lit. Existing sign is within the parking area.

NOTIFICATIONS/APPROVALS/CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- Saratoga County referral is required.
- DRC Architectural review is required.

Discussion ensued concerning receiving DRC advisory opinion/approval.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bill Moore, Chairman opened the public hearing at 8:21 P.M.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

None heard.

Bill Moore, Chairman stated the public hearing will remain open. A resolution will be prepared and presented at the next ZBA meeting scheduled for May 9, 2016.

OLD BUSINESS:

4. **#2689.1 REJUVENATION HOMES MODIFICATION**, 30 Lafayette Street, area variance modification for constructed changes to a new single-family residence and detached garage; seeking additional relief from the minimum rear yard and minimum distance between principal and accessory buildings in the Urban Residential-2 District.

RECUSAL:

Board member Susan Steer recused from this application.

This application was heard at the March 21, 2016 meeting and adjourned to April 11, 2016. The Board requested that the applicant submit an updated survey. The application was further adjourned to April 25, 2016. The public hearing was opened and remains open.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be a Type II action, and therefore exempt from further SEQRA review.

Susan Barden, Senior Planner stated the Board asked for an updated survey on this application showing the existing patio and fire pit. The applicant did provide the requested information. Information was also requested concerning whether the fire pit is considered an accessory structure requiring a setback from the property line. Steve Shaw, Zoning and Building Inspector stated the fire pit is not considered an accessory structure and does not require any setback.

Discussion ensued considering the amount of relief requested by the applicant, and how it happened.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bill Moore, Chairman stated the public hearing was opened and remains open.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

None heard.

Bill Moore, Chairman closed the public hearing at 8:27 P.M.

DISCLOSURE:

Oksana Ludd stated she did view the March 28, 2016 meeting and is prepared to vote on this application this evening.

James Helicke presented the following resolution.

**#2689.1
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
30 Lafayette St.
Saratoga Springs NY 12866**

from the determination of the Building Inspector involving the premises at 30 Lafayette St, in the City of Saratoga Springs, New York being tax parcel numbers 165.68-1-73 in the Inside District, on the Assessment Map of said City.

The appellant having applied for a modification of a previously approved area variance under the Zoning Ordinance of said City, to permit the constructed changes to a new single-family residence and detached garage in a UR-2 district and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application held on the 21st day of March and the 11th and 25th days of April 2016.

In consideration of the balance between benefit to the applicant with detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, I move that the following area variances for the following amount of relief:

Dimension of relief:	Required:	Previously approved:	Proposed for new construction:	Total relief requested:
Min. separation principal from accessory buildings	10 ft.	6'	5'	5 ft. (50%)

Min. total side yard:	45'	37'	36.3'	8.7' (19.3%)
Min. rear yard	25'	22.7'	18.3'	6.7' (26.8%)

As per the submitted revised plans or lesser dimensions, be **approved**.

Whereas the applicant has indicated that although the original project approved by this Board in 2013 was "built to the exact dimensions that were originally approved," the lot on which it is placed is irregularly shaped and the as-built final survey has revealed that shape, and the differences listed above.

The applicant further points out that the project included the preservation of a portion of an existing older home, demolition of the remainder of that home and the construction of a complete residential structure using the preserved portion of the old home plus new materials. A new detached garage was also built, and sited according to the principal structure and the original applicant's understanding of the parcel's dimensions.

Upon analysis of these changes, and the original considerations of benefit to the applicant and potential adverse impacts to the neighborhood or district, the Board finds the changes to be minor in nature. The project as constructed is consistent with the Board's original findings:

- It moved the parcel to greater conformity with respect to setback requirements;
- It added off-street parking; and
- It is more consistent with neighborhood density and setbacks than the pre-existing arrangement of houses on this and the neighboring parcel.

The Board therefore determines the variance in matter #2689, 30 Lafayette St, can be modified.

Gary Hasbrouck seconded the motion.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

None heard.

VOTE:

Bill Moore, Chairman, in favor; Oksana Ludd, alternate, in favor; Adam McNeill, Secretary, in favor; Gary Hasbrouck, in favor; Skip Carlson, in favor; James Helicke, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 6-0

NOTE:

Board Member Susan Steer resumed her position on the Board.

5. **#2883 ASHTON GARAGE**, 149 Grand Avenue, area variance to construct a detached garage; seeking relief from the maximum accessory building coverage requirement in the Urban Residential-3 District.

This application was heard at the April 11, 2016 meeting and adjourned to April 25, 2016. The public hearing was opened and remains open.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be a Type II action and therefore exempt from further SEQRA review.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bill Moore, Chairman stated the public hearing was opened and remains open.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

None heard.

Bill Moore, Chairman closed the public hearing at 8:37 P.M.

DISCLOSURE:

Oksana Ludd stated she did view the March 28, 2016 meeting and is prepared to vote on this application this evening.

Gary Hasbrouck presented the following resolution.

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
Robert Ashton
149 Grand Avenue
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

From the determination of the Building Inspector involving the premises at 65 York Avenue Avenue in the City of Saratoga Springs, NY, being tax parcel number 165.66-1-18 on the Assessment Map of said City.

The Applicant having applied for an area variance from the City Zoning Ordinance for maximum accessory building coverage for construction of a detached garage in the Urban Residential – 3 District and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application on April 11 and 25, 2016.

In consideration of the balance between the benefit to the Applicant with detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, I move that the following variance for the following amount of relief:

Type of Requirement	District Dimensional Requirement	Proposed	Relief Requested
Maximum accessory building coverage:	10%	11.4%	1.4% (14%)

As per the submitted plans or lesser dimensions, BE APPROVED for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has demonstrated this benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. The applicant notes there is no other land available for purchase and wants to be able to shelter 2 cars from the weather. The applicant indicated that removing the rear exterior stairs leading to the second floor would not be feasible because relocating them inside would take the space utilized for parking the cars.
2. The applicant has demonstrated that granting this variance will not produce an undesirable change in neighborhood character or detriment to the nearby properties. The application states, "The garage design with the carport is compatible with the existing house on the lot and surrounding structures".
3. The request for relief is not substantial. The 14% variance is essentially the size of the staircase in the rear of the building.

4. The applicant has demonstrated that granting this variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. As the application states, "The carport is will not overshadow neighboring structures..." The Board notes permeability requirements will be maintained.
5. The request for relief may be considered a self-created hardship. However, self-creation is not necessarily fatal to the application.

Adam McNeill, Secretary seconded the motion.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

None heard.

VOTE:

Bill Moore, Chairman, in favor; Oksana Ludd, alternate, in favor; Susan Steer, in favor; Adam McNeill, Secretary, in favor; Gary Hasbrouck, in favor; Skip Carlson, in favor; James Helicke, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

6. **#2884 TRUECUTZ BARBER SHOP**, 44 Jefferson Street, use variance to permit a barber shop; seeking relief from the permitted uses in the Urban Residential-2 District.

This application was heard at the April 11, 21016 meeting and adjourned to April 25, 2016. The Board requested that the applicant submit a floor plan of the existing building. The public hearing was opened and remains open.

DISCLOSURE:

James Helicke stated he visited the location yesterday. The applicant did provide a tour of the property. We did not discuss the specifics of the application.

SEQRA:

The application appears to be unlisted. The Board reviewed Part I of the SEQRA short EAF provided by the applicant. No large or important areas of concern were noted.

The Board reviewed Part II of the SEQRA short EAF. No large or important areas of concern were noted.

Gary Hasbrouck made a motion for a SEQRA Negative Declaration in the matter of the application of Truecutz Barber Shop, 44 Jefferson Street.

Susan Steer seconded the motion.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

None heard.

VOTE:

Bill Moore, Chairman, in favor; Oksana Ludd, alternate, in favor; Susan Steer, in favor; Adam McNeill, Secretary, in favor; Gary Hasbrouck, in favor; Skip Carlson, in favor; James Helicke, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bill Moore, Chairman stated the public hearing was opened and remains open.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

None heard.

Bill Moore, Chairman closed the public hearing at 8:37 P.M.

James Helicke presented the following resolution.

#2884
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
TrueCutz Barbershop
Casey James and Lamont Washington
300 Maple Avenue, Apt. 5, Ballston Spa, NY 12020
13C1 Jefferson Terrace, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

From the determination of the Zoning and Building Inspector involving the premises at 44 Jefferson Street, in the City of Saratoga Springs, New York being tax parcel number 178.28-1-38 in the Inside District, on the assessment map of said City.

The appellant having applied for a use variance under the Zoning Ordinance of said City to permit a barbershop in an Urban Residential – 2 District.

As shown by the submitted application, supplemental documentation and oral presentation to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and public hearing having been held on April 11 and 25, 2016 be **approved** because the Zoning requirements create an unnecessary hardship.

1. The applicant has demonstrated that this property cannot yield a reasonable financial return as demonstrated by competent financial evidence, if used for any permissible use. The property has an existing use variance "to erect and operate a grocery store" from June 12, 1946.

The applicant provides a statement from the current property owner stating, "During my 8 years with this property I have tried twice unsuccessfully to run a profitable convenience store". Since that time the property has been vacant for the past four years. Further stating, "During the time the building has been vacant I have attempted to sell and lease the property to no avail". The property owner states that he (and the previous owner), "both agree that with such a prominent and popular establishment that is the 5 points convenient store right up the street it is impossible to have a thriving and profitable convenience store at this location".

The application states that the property would not be suitable for a single-family residence. The existing building on the property is a commercial building "There is no kitchen, no refrigerator, no stove, no oven, no kitchen sink, and one very small bathroom with no shower". The application provides an estimate by a contractor stating, "The building is 800 square feet and it's meant for commercial use only...If converted to a residence right now it would only be suitable as a studio apartment...To convert the building into (a) residence suitable for a studio apartment in my professional opinion would cost no less than \$80,000". The Board concludes that this conversion to a permitted residential use would prove financially unfeasible.

2. The applicant has demonstrated the alleged hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood or district. The building is a commercial building in a residential neighborhood

that has had a use variance since 1946. Commercial buildings are uncommon. The building and its use as a grocery store are therefore distinct from a neighborhood/district that is residential in character.

3. The applicant has demonstrated that the requested use variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The property has been commercially used since 1946. The property has been vacant and in disrepair since the owner's failure to sell or rent for the uses permitted – a grocery store or single-family residence. The barbershop would be a low impact business – the operators would be utilizing the existing 800 sq. ft. structure and have two to four hair care stations. The hours of operation are identified as being less than when the property was operated as a grocery store and are compatible with a residential neighborhood. The applicants identify that many of their clients would be from the immediate area and would likely walk/ride to the barbershop. On street parking is available in the immediate vicinity of the property.

4. The applicant has shown that the alleged hardship is not self-created. Neighborhood groceries have become increasingly rare in recent decades. The application states that both previous and current owners have unsuccessfully attempted to operate a neighborhood grocery and “both believe that a large part of their failure is due to the competition from Five Points convenience store”, a short distance away. The Board finds persuasive arguments that it would be difficult to operate two neighborhood groceries in such short proximity and that the hardship suffered by the applicant was not self-created.

Conditions:

- Prior use variance for a grocery store is eliminated with implementation of this use variance
- Approval is limited to the existing +/- 800 sq. ft. building – expansion to or replacement of the existing building would require additional board review and action

Note:

- No parking is permitted that extends into ROW

Susan Steer seconded the motion.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

None heard.

VOTE:

Bill Moore, Chairman, in favor; Oksana Ludd, alternate, in favor; Susan Steer, in favor; Adam McNeill, Secretary, in favor; Gary Hasbrouck, in favor; Skip Carlson, in favor; James Helicke, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

7. **#2885 CARR RESIDENTIAL ADDITION**, 13 Oakland Drive, area variance to construct additions to an existing single-family residence; seeking relief from the minimum front yard setback (Oakland Drive), minimum front yard setback (Lawrence Street) and maximum principal building coverage in the Urban Residential-1 District.

This application was heard at the April 11, 2016 meeting and adjourned to April 25, 2016. The public hearing was opened and remains open.

SEQRA:

Action appears to be a Type II action, and therefore exempt from further SEQRA review.

Applicant: Dave and Donna Carr

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bill Moore, Chairman stated the public hearing was opened and remains open.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

None heard.

Bill Moore, Chairman closed the public hearing at 9:02 P.M.

Susan Steer presented the following resolution.

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
DONNA AND DAVID CARR
13 OAKLAND DRIVE
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

From the determination of the Building Inspector involving the premises at 13 Oakland Drive in the City of Saratoga Springs, NY, being tax parcel number 166.0-1-9 on the Assessment Map of said City. The Applicant having applied for an area variance to construct additions to an existing single-family residence in the UR-1 Zoning District and public notice having been duly given of hearings on said application on April 11 and 25, 2016.

In consideration of the balance between the benefit to the Applicant with the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, I move that the following variance for the following amount of relief:

Type of Requirement	District Dimensional Requirement	Proposed	Relief Requested
Maximum principal building coverage	20%	25%	5% (25%)
Minimum front yard setback: Lawrence Street (AKA Audrey Lane)	30 feet	17 feet	13 feet (43%)
Minimum front yard setback: Oakland Drive	30 feet	22 feet	8 feet (27%)

As per the submitted plans or lesser dimensions, BE APPROVED for the following reasons:

1. The Applicant has demonstrated this benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible to the Applicant. The existing residence is small and has about 1,100 square feet of habitable space. The Applicant proposes to increase the size of it by constructing several small additions and finishing the basement. The Applicant considered constructing a second story, but determined that doing so would be "out of character with the existing neighborhood which is mostly one-story ranches." The Applicant stated that this "modest" proposal of an additional 450 square feet was the minimum amount of additional square footage needed to achieve their goals.
2. The Applicant has demonstrated that granting this variance will not produce an undesirable change in neighborhood character or detriment to the nearby properties. The two larger additions will be at the rear of the

home and the smaller additions on the front will “match the existing façade.” The additions total only about 450 square feet and the residence will continue to resemble the other residences in the neighborhood.

3. The request for relief could be considered substantial as they are all at or exceed 25%, however, this is offset by the fact that the existing lot is substandard, the residence currently sits over the two front yard setbacks and the additions do not run the entire side of length of the residence. The fact that the additions only total about 450 square feet also mitigate any substantiality.
4. The Applicant has demonstrated that granting this variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. The additions are small and the variance on the Lawrence Street/Audrey Lane side of the residence is for a window well that will be below grade, not visible from street level and is necessary so the Applicant will be able to finish the basement portion of the home into habitable space. The Applicant stated that he intends to update and improve the landscaping on the property and will keep as many trees as possible.
5. The request for relief may be considered a self-created hardship. However, self-creation is not necessarily fatal to the application.

Adam McNeill, Secretary, seconded the motion.

Bill Moore, Chairman asked if there was any further discussion.

None heard.

VOTE:

Bill Moore, Chairman, in favor; Oksana Ludd, alternate, in favor; Susan Steer, in favor; Adam McNeill, Secretary, in favor; Gary Hasbrouck, in favor; Skip Carlson, in favor; James Helicke, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Gary Hasbrouck made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2016 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes with corrections or additions as submitted.

Susan Steer seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Bill Moore, Chairman, in favor; Oksana Ludd, in favor; Susan Steer, in favor; Adam McNeill, Secretary, abstained; Gary Hasbrouck, in favor; Skip Carlson, in favor; James Helicke, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 6-0-1

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Bill Moore, Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

APPROVED 6/20/16