



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES (DRAFT)

MONDAY, MAY 08, 2023

6:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL TO ORDER: Gage Simpson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:31P.M.

PRESENT: Gage Simpson- Chair; Brad Gallagher- Vice Chair, Cheryl Grey
Brendan Dailey, Emily Bergmann, Alice Smith, Shafer Gaston

ABSENT:

STAFF: Aneisha Samuels, Senior Planner, City of Saratoga Springs
Jackie White, Counsel to the Land Use Boards

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.

ZBA APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **#20230226 253 Nelson Two Family to Single Family Conversion**, 253 Nelson Avenue, Area variance to permit the conversion of a two family building into a single family residence within the Urban Residential -3 (UR-3) District.

AREA VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS:

TYPE OF REQUIREMENT	REQUIRED	Proposed	Relief Requested
Min Lot Size (2 principal structures)	13200sqft.	9790sqft.	3410 sqft. (25.8%)

Mr. Bob Flansburg represented this application he said the applicant is hoping to have two single family structures on a single lot. He mentioned that this lot appeared like a missing tooth as you walked down Nelson when compared to the other homes. He mentioned that the existing carriage house will be converted into a single family and they already have a building permit. The plan is to remove one of the existing kitchens. The Plan is also to remove the existing balcony that goes to the second floor. Generally 75% of the lot is vacant. Based on the proposed survey the applicant is proposing to build a single family residence, they will be under the permitted lot coverage and all the required setbacks will also be maintained. Parking was also evaluated and the existing parking will be repositioned to accommodate the requirements for both single family homes.

Gage outlined that what he understood is that the current two family will be converted to a single family and an additional single family structure will be built and the relief request is for lot size and the reason it is 13200sqft is because the requirements is 6600 per single family. Gage asked if the applicant looked at other properties

with similar lot sizes. Charlie Goodridge said he evaluated seven lots within walking distance of the lot that were all below the 6600 min lot size requirement. Cherie asked the applicant to provide the addresses discussed in writing so the Board can evaluate after this meeting. The locations evaluated include: 215 Caroline Street, 217 Caroline Street, 177 East Avenue, 203 East Avenue, 15 Jumel Place, 241 Nelson Avenue and 243 Nelson Avenue.

Emily clarified if the applicant planned on removing the shed, and she also asked what the sq. footage of the proposed home would be. The applicant confirmed that the setback and coverage requirements would be met including overhangs.

Brendan asked for clarification regarding the sidewalk and repeated that the applicant should provide comps and have them considered other alternatives. The applicant stated that before the UDO they would not be permitted to have two single family structures in UR-3, several design alternatives were considered and this current proposal was the most feasible. Brendan also asked about drainage and the potential impacts.

Cherie later followed up with questions pertaining to parking and if the applicant is able to provide adequate parking for the two single family. The applicant stated they are trying to provide 4 parking spaces. Two parking spaces within the proposed new construction and the other two will be on the paved area. Cherie noted that the lot seems tight for what is being proposed and that it might not be appropriate to have two single family structures on this size lot in this neighborhood. Cherie needed some clarification about the single family fronting on an alley.

Public hearing was open at 6:52 by Gage Simpson

Public Comments:

Owners of 249 Nelson- Property immediately adjacent to the proposed address- the resident commented that the public notice failed to include the new construction and feels the notice was misleading. Since it only outlined the conversion of the two family to single family and failed to include the new construction. The commenter felt the request was significant and the application form was misleading since the required variance is over 20% and was considered insignificant by the application. He felt there may be some issues with offsite parking and he doesn't see how the parking requirements will be met. The commenter also mentioned that the carriage house is more of an apartment than a carriage house. The commenter strongly opposed the application since the notice in his opinion was misleading and the adverse effects on the neighborhood and the sketchy conversion plan.

Anthony Johnston of 124 Clinton Street- Said the architect was here 1 yr. ago and it was like moving Lego parts. There is no parking and my friend who works for the IRS and wanted to know if anyone on this matter was related to the architect or applicant. He wanted to know why this project was brought before the board. He felt if this project went through there would be a colossal accident.

Motion to request Planning Board Advisory proposed by Cherie, seconded by Shafer - Motion carries 7-0

2. #20230213 11 Pine Alley Variance Extension, Area variance to permit the construction of a two-story single-family residence within the Urban Residential -3 (UR-3) District- Extension.

Mathew Shepanzyk is the applicant and represented himself he said the previous approval fell through the cracks since he was expecting a child and though the contractor would follow through. The applicant noted nothing has changed with the proposal and the plans are the same.

Cherie Asked if the applicant had planned to live in the home considering the size and since it is a 1 bedroom will it be feasible for his growing family.

Shafer asked if the applicant had a firm lined up to ensure the construction happened this time around. Hoping we can prevent a later extension.

Aneisha reminded the Board the applicant is entitled to two extensions as long as the project has not changed and the application is the same as what was previously approved.

The applicant mentioned he still needs to apply for his lot line adjustment from the planning Board.

Public hearing was open at 7:11 by Gage
No public comments

Public hearing Closed 7:12 by Gage
Motion presented by Cherie as follows.

#20230213
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
Matthew and Meghan Shepanzyk
410 Canada Street
Lake George, NY 12845

Based on the submitted evidence that the application for an extension of a granted area variance does not differ from the original application and approval, and that there have been no changes in the condition of the property or neighborhood warranting otherwise, the Board moves that the application of Matthew and Meghan Shepanzyk for the property located at 11 Pine Alley in the City of Saratoga Springs, and identified as tax parcel 165.43-2-24.2 that was granted on September 27, 2021 for construction of a two-story single family residence in the UR-3 District, be approved and that the variance approval be extended for 18 months from the date that such resolution expired, March 27, 2023 with the new expiration date to be September 27, 2024. The variance shall expire on September 27, 2024 unless the necessary building permit has been issued and actual construction begun as per the Zoning Ordinance or otherwise further extended.

It is so moved, dated: May 8, 2023

Motion seconded by Gage

Passes by the following votes:

AYES:7 (G. Simpson, B. Gallagher, S. Gaston, C. Grey, E. Bergmann, B. Dailey, A. Smith,)

ABSTAINED:

RECUSED:

NAYES:

CONTINUED BUSINESS

3. #20230162 77 Hathorn Deck Area Variance, 77 Hathorn, Area variance to permit the construction of a front deck within the Urban Residential-1 (UR-1) District.

At the request of the applicant the matter is being adjourned to a future meeting. Public hearing remains open.

4. **#20230161 8 Taylor Shed Area Variance.** 8 Taylor Street, Area variance to permit the rear encroachment of an existing rear patio within the Urban Residential - 2 District.

Brad Recused himself from this application

AREA VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS:

TYPE OF REQUIREMENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	TOTAL RELIEF REQUESTED
Corner Side to Patio	10ft	7ft.	3ft (30%)
Accessory to Rear	5ft.	3.3ft	1.7ft (34%)
Patio to Rear	25ft	13ft.	12ft (48%)

Laurie and Gary Cretelli represented themselves both of 8 Taylor Street. Laurie mentioned she did her homework based in the requests from the last meeting. She found several comparable that are also within the UR-2 District. Laurie later noted she also addressed the impacts on permeability, and self-created elements surrounding their application. The applicant noted she found several shed that are within the setback she also stated that most if not all homes on Taylor have a two car garage except there lot and they believe this justifies the need for a shed. Many of the shed observed were part of a property line or fence. The applicant noted that their shed is smaller than most of the shed presented. The applicant noted she was willing to provide additional comparable if the board needed more. The applicant noted they applied for the variance when they were out of state and was unaware of the visual impacts to 6 Taylor.

Gage noted he appreciated the applicants providing the comparables but suggested that the applicant provide an overhead image of the location of the comparable.

Cherie felt the applicants needed an accurate survey. Gage noted the applicants may need additional relief but would need a survey to be sure.

Shafer had one questions, he wanted to know the feasibility of moving the shed, and he wanted some clarification regarding some public comments. He noted that basically what the board wants is a final drawing of what the patio and shed looks like today. He wanted some clarification on the actual relief needs as they were unclear since no survey was provided.

Emily wanted to know if the entire fence would need to be replaced or only that section where the shed is currently located.

Gage stated Public hearing remains open

Public Comments:

James from 6 Taylor Street had public comments. He noted that the neighborhood was built by Witt construction with a well-known higher price point. He states none of the comparable were in the south side development and would therefore be outside of the neighborhood. He noted that the Cretelli mentioned that there was no access to remove the shed and he believed this is not factual. He states that there are several misleading information in the application provided by the applicants. He mentioned that drainage would be a huge problem since is storm water runoff gutters are run underground to the other side of the fence.

Cherie noted she visited the property

Gage noted public comments will remain open and the applicant should provide the required additional information before the next meeting.

5. **#20230159** 672 Roof and Canopy Extension. 672 Crescent Avenue, Area variance to permit the expansion of the existing single-family home in the Rural Residential- (RR) District.

Discussion ensued among the Board and since there is some missing information and the matter was adjourned to a future meeting.

6. **#20221034 Marion Avenue Zoning Interpretation**, Appeal to the Zoning Board 9/12/22 Interpretation of section 1.7 regarding 31-33 Marion Ave

Gage asked if the Board had any additional questions- No comments received
Gage Noted Public comments is still open and if there is anyone from the public with comments- no comments received

Public hearing closed at 7:40pm by Gage Simpson

The following motion was presented by Cherie Grey

#20221034
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
John Iacoponi
4 Avenue A, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

WHEREAS, Applicant John Iacoponi having applied for an interpretation appeal of a Determination issued on September 12, 2022 by the City Zoning and Building Inspector involving the applicability of Section 240-1.7 of the City Zoning Ordinance enacted on October 4, 2012 to property located at 31-33 Marion Avenue and identified as Tax Map Parcel Nos. 166.5-4-1.1, 166.5-4-1.2 and 166.5-4-1.3 (the “Property”); and

WHEREAS, Stewart’s Shops Corps. is the owner of the Property and the Building Inspector’s Determination was rendered in the context of certain land use approval applications made by Stewart’s in furtherance of its proposed development of the Property (the “Project”); and

WHEREAS, the Building Inspector initially rendered a determination regarding the Project by letter dated May 16, 2022, but subsequently modified his determination by letter dated September 12, 2022 (both letters are attached and incorporated herein) and the September 12, 2022 Determination is the subject of the present appeal; and

WHEREAS, under the Zoning Ordinance, the boundary between the Tourist Related Business District and the Urban Residential-2 District runs coincident along the lot line between Tax Map Parcels 166.5-4-1.1 and 166.5-4-1.3; and

WHEREAS, Zoning Ordinance Section 240-1.7 states:

“INTERPRETATION OF DISTRICT BOUNDARIES Where there is uncertainty as to the boundary of any district contained within this Chapter or as shown on City maps, the following rules shall apply:

A. Unless shown to the contrary on a City map, the boundary lines of districts are the center lines of streets, or such lines extended, the center lines of railroad rights-of way, the center lines of creeks and waterways.

B. Where district boundaries are indicated as approximately following the City boundary line, lot lines, or projections thereof, said boundaries shall be construed to be coincident with such lines.

C. If a center line or right-of-way line of a street, highway, railroad, public utility, or watercourse, which is approximately coincident with a district boundary, is moved up to a distance of 50 feet, the district line shall be automatically adjusted to be coincident with such line.

D. Where a zoning district boundary line divides a lot or land in single ownership as existing at the time of this enactment, the district requirements on either side of the boundary may be construed, at the property owner’s option, as extending into the remaining portion of the property for a distance not exceeding 100 feet;” and

WHEREAS, the Building Inspector’s Determination found that 1) the Property owner “is not required to establish uncertainty as to the location of the boundary between districts in order to request utilization of the provisions of Section 1.7(D),” 2) for application of Subsection 1.7(D) lands must have been in single ownership at the time of the October 2012 enactment of the Zoning Ordinance ; and 3) accordingly, requirements of the TRB District “may be construed to extend 100 feet north into parcel 166.5-4-1.1;” and

WHEREAS, Applicant filed this appeal of the Determination on November 09, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the Board opened a duly-noticed Public Hearing on this appeal on February 27, 2023 and closed the public hearing on May 08, 2023; and

AND NOW THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY,

RESOLVED, that the City of Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals makes the following findings:

- 1) The first sentence of Zoning Ordinance Section 240-1.7 is clear and unambiguous. The Section requires that there be “uncertainty as to the boundary of any district contained within [the Zoning Ordinance] or as shown on City maps” before the “rules” of subsections A through D shall apply.
- 2) There has been no uncertainty established or even alleged as to the location of the district boundaries as related to the Property. The district boundary between the Tourist Related Business District and the Urban Residential-2 District of the Zoning Ordinance runs coincident along the lot line between Tax Map Parcels 166.5-4-1.1 and 166.5-4-1.3. The location of the boundary line between these Districts was clear at the time of enactment of the 2012 Zoning Ordinance and at the time the Building Inspector rendered his Determination. Therefore, none of Subsections A, B, C or D of Section 240-1.7 the Zoning Ordinance can apply to this Property or the related Zoning District boundaries.
- 3) The Board agrees that the Property at issue was in single ownership under Stewart’s at the time that the 2012 Zoning Ordinance was enacted and remains so today. However, the ownership requirements for the lands set forth in Zoning Ordinance Section 240-1.7(D) are irrelevant as this provision does not apply as the required uncertainty of the Zoning District boundary has not been established.

4) The Board acknowledges that the City Building Inspector may have previously allowed property owners/applicants to avail themselves of the benefits of Section 240-1.7(D) without first establishing uncertainty as to Zoning District boundaries. However, the Board believes that the present Application is the first instance in which the ZBA has been directly called upon to interpret this provision and the Board is not bound by the Building Inspector’s previous application of this provision; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Building Inspector’s September 12, 2022 Determination is hereby overturned and Zoning Ordinance Section 240-1.7(D) does not apply to extend the district requirements for the TRB District into Tax Map Parcel 166.5-4-1.1, which is located in the UR-2 District under the 2012 Zoning Ordinance.

Duly adopted this 08 day of May, 2023, by the following vote:

Motion seconded by Emily Bergmann

Gage asked if the board had any comments, Alice stated that at the time of purchase the property was clearly in two different districts and she felt it would be unfair to allow the 100ft move since there was no uncertainty at the time of purchase.

Passes by the following votes:

AYES: 7 (G. Simpson, B. Gallagher, C. Grey, E. Bergmann, B. Dailey, A. Smith, S. Gaston)

ABSTAINED:

RECUSED:

NAYES:

7 #20230016 Liberty Housing Area Variance, Crescent Avenue/Jefferson Street, Area variance to permit the development of workforce housing within the Urban Residential-4 (UR-4) District.

AREA VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS:

TYPE OF REQUIREMENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	TOTAL RELIEF REQUESTED
Interior side	8 ft.	6 ft.	2 ft. or 25%

Stephanie Farradino represented the applicants, stated that the planning Board in a previous meeting issues a favorable advisory on April 27th. She stated that Steve Dobbs is also with her and they would be happy to answer any questions.

Cherie stated that the height variance is a little tough for her but after the last presentation she believes that if it is workforce housing it can be tied into the city in a way people can access and make use of our wonderful downtown.

Public hearing closed at 7:52

The following motion was presented by Brendan Dailey

20230016
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
Liberty Affordable Housing Inc.
117 W Liberty Street
Rome, NY 13440

From the determination of the Building Inspector involving the premises at the corner of Crescent and Jefferson Street in the City of Saratoga Springs, NY, being tax parcel number 179.-5-8 on the Assessment Map of said City. The Applicant having applied for an area variance to permit construction of an affordable housing complex in the Urban Residential 4 (UR-4) District and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application on (insert dates)

In consideration of the balance between the benefit to the Applicants 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 Height	40'	48'	8' (20%)

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 considered other alternatives, including an alternative roof line.
2. The applicant has demonstrated that this granting this variance will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character and does not negatively alter the streetscape. The applicants provided the Board with information on comparable heights in the district, most notably the Saratoga Casino and Raceway Hotel. The residents living off of Jefferson Street on Clubhouse drive will have limited ability to see the property because of the nearly 20 acres of canopy on the corner of Crescent and Jefferson Street.
3. The requested variances are not considered substantial.
4. The applicant has demonstrated that granting this variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. Much of the parcel will remain forested and protected as there is an active wetland present on the property. District permeability will be met.
5. The request for relief is a self-created hardship as the applicant wishes to build this complex however, self-creation is not necessarily fatal to the application.

Notes: The City Planning Board issued a favorable advisory, County Planning Board found no significant county wide impact and City Council concluded a negative SEQR declaration

It is so moved, May 8, 2023.
 Motion seconded by Emily

Passes by the following votes:

AYES: 7 (G. Simpson, B. Gallagher, C. Grey, E. Bergmann, B. Dailey, A. Smith, S. Gaston)

ABSTAINED:

RECUSED:

NAYES:

8 #20230140 84 Adams Area Variance, 84 Adams Street, Area variance to permit the construction of a detached garage in the Sub-urban residential District

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding the applicant's response to making changes and since the applicant has agreed to not make any further changes the board felt they had adequate information to make a decision on the matter.

Brendan Dailey Presented the following motion

**# 20230140
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
Joseph Calandra
84 Adams Road
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866**

From the determination of the Building Inspector involving the premises at 84 Adams Road in the City of Saratoga Springs, NY, being tax parcel number 177.15-1-60 on the Assessment Map of said City. The Applicant having applied for an area variance under the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to permit the construction of a three car garage, in the Suburban Residential 2 (SR-2) District and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application on April 10th, and April 24th, 2023.

In consideration of the balance between the benefit to the Applicants 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
Accessory to Rear	30'	15'	15' (50%)

As per the submitted plans or lesser relief, be DENIED for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has not demonstrated this benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. The applicant has not presented the board with considerable alternatives that would lessen the accessory to rear variance requirement.
2. The applicant has not demonstrated that granting this variance will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or detriment to nearby properties. The applicant did provide some photos of other three car garages on nearby properties, but it is unclear whether or not those garages required setback variances. Subsequently, more neighborhood comparisons are necessary to understand the impact on surrounding properties.

3. The board considered the substantiality of the proposed variance listed in the table above and determined that the 50 percent variance is considered to be substantial in this context.
4. The Applicant has not demonstrated that granting this variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood.
5. The request for relief is a self-created hardship as the applicant wishes to build the garage that exceeds district zoning requirements. While self-creation by itself is not fatal to an area variance application, it is a consideration weighed by the Board.

It is so moved, May 8, 2023.

Motion Seconded by Emily Bergmann

Passes by the following votes:

AYES:7 (G. Simpson, B. Gallagher, S. Gaston, C. Grey, E. Bergmann, B. Dailey, A. Smith,)

ABSTAINED:

RECUSED:

NAYES:

9 #20230142 44 Jefferson Area Variance, 44 Jefferson Street, Area variance to permit the conversion of current structure to a single family within the urban Residential -2 District

Cherie Recused from This application

Mr. Joe Moore of 32 Jefferson Street represented the application and noted that he made adjustments as requested to the left side of the building to increase the percentage as total requested variance.

Aneisha noted that the applicant needed to provide better drawings as the ones provided were hand drawn and not very clear. The applicant discussed the changes to the proposal. The applicant noted he would be willing to eliminate the bump-out and he has added a few ft. to the rear.

Gage asked what the total side request would be the applicant noted it would be 14ft total side yard.

Emily noted the plans presented were a bit confusing and would like more clarification on the drawing, discussion ensued and the meeting was recessed for 5 minutes to allow for Aneisha to provide the hand drawn plans submitted by the applicant. After the 5 minute recess the board reviewed the plans as provided.

Alice noted she needed some clarification regarding the setbacks now compared to what is being proposed. And the board concluded that the request is for 14ft total side.

Public hearing closed at 8:15pm by Gage Simpson
Gage presented the following motion

#20230142
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
Joseph Moore
32 Jefferson Street
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

from the determination of the 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 on the Assessment Map of said City.

The applicant having applied for an area variance under the UDO of said City to permit the conversion of a property into a single family home in the Urban Residential-2 (UR-2) District and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application held on April 10 through May 8, 2023.

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 amounts of relief:

TYPE OF REQUIREMENT	DISTRICT DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENT	PROPOSED	RELIEF REQUESTED
INTERIOR SIDE	8'	3'	5' (62.5%)
TOTAL SIDE	20'	14'	6' (30%)

As per the submitted plans or lesser relief, 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 desires to convert a small structure into a two-story single family home. Per the applicant, the current structure is pre-existing, non-conforming and the applicant would like to build a second story within the currently existing setbacks. The Board notes the property is pre-existing, non-conforming undersized for this district and there is no additional land for purchase.
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 current structure is pre-existing, non-conforming and per the applicant, the addition will improve the quality of the building. The Board notes the plans show the second story will not have windows on the side within the setback to mitigate any possible impact to the neighboring property.
3. The Board notes the requested variances are considered substantial, however, these are mitigated by the fact that the property is undersized and the setbacks already exist and will not be increased.
4. The Board finds these variances will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. The property will meet minimum permeability.
5. The alleged difficulty is self-created insofar as the applicant desires to convert the structure into a two-story home, but this is not necessarily fatal to the application.

It is so moved.

Motion seconded by Brendan

Dated: May 8, 2023

Passes by the following votes:

AYES: 6 (G. Simpson, B. Gallagher, E. Bergmann, B. Dailey, A. Smith, S. Gaston)

ABSTAINED:

RECUSED: 1 (C. Grey)

NAYES:

Please find below the record of decision from the meeting



City of Saratoga Springs

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

City Hall • 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
518.587.3550

www.saratoga-springs.org

ZBA Members
Gage Simpson (Chair)
Brad Gallagher (Vice Chair)
Cheryl Grey
Emily Bergmann
Brendan Dalley
Shafer Gaston
Alice Smith (Alternate)
John Daley (Alternate)

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - Monday, May 10, 2023

Record of Decision

Present: C. Grey, B. Gallagher, A. Smith, B. Dalley, E. Bergmann, G. Simpson, S. Gaston

Absent:

A. Applications Under Consideration

New Business:					
Agenda Order	Project #	Project Title	Project Location	Project Description	ACTION
1	20230226	253 Nelson Two Family to Single Family Conversion	253 Nelson	Area variance to permit the conversion of a two family building into a single family residence within the Urban Residential -3 (UR-3) District.	Public hearing open, item adjour to later meeting date, motion to request PB Advisory (Parking an Density) approved 7-0
2	20230213	11 Pine Alley Variance Extension	11 Pine Alley	Area variance to permit the construction of a two-story single-family residence within the Urban Residential -3 (UR-3) District.	Public hearing open and closed, motion approved 7-0

Continued Business:					
Agenda Order	Project #	Project Title	Project Location	Project Description	ACTION
3	20230162	77 Hathorn Deck	77 Hathorn	Area variance to permit the construction of a front deck within the Urban Residential-1 (UR-1) District.	Public hearing remains open- item adjourned to later date
4	20230161	8 Taylor Shed	8 Taylor	Area variance to permit the rear encroachment of an existing rear patio within the Urban Residential - 2 District.	Public hearing remains open- item adjourned to later date
5	20230159	672 Roof and Canopy Extension	672 Crescent	Area variance to permit the expansion of the existing single-family home in the Rural Residential- (RR) District.	Public hearing remains open- item adjourned to later date
6	20221034	Marion Ave Zoning Interpretation	Marion Ave	Appeal to the Zoning Board 9/12/22 Interpretation of section 1.7 regarding 31-33 Marion Ave	Public hearing closed, motion approved 7-0.
7	20230016	Liberty Housing Area Variance - Height	Crescent Ave/Jefferson St	Area variance to permit the development of workforce housing within the Urban Residential-4 (UR-4) District.	Public hearing closed, motion approved 7-0.
8	20230140	84 Adams	84 Adams	Area variance to permit the construction of a detached garage in the Sub-urban residential District	Public hearing closed, motion approved 7-0.
9	20230142	44 Jefferson Single Family Conversion	44 Jefferson	Area variance to permit the conversion of current structure to a single family within the urban Residential -2 District	Public hearing closed- motion approved 6-0 (Cherie Recused)

C. Approval of Meeting Minutes: no minutes approved

05/10/2023

Received by Accounts Dept.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

No meeting minutes were approved.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Gage Simpson, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 8:24 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Aneisha Samuels
Senior Planner