

MINUTES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
SEPTEMBER 7, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: WILLIAM MOWERSON
JOAN SALOMON
NANETTE ALBANESE
PATRICIA CASTELLI
THOMAS WARREN, ALTERNATE

ABSENT: DANIEL SULLIVAN

ALSO PRESENT: Dennis Michaels, Esq. Deputy Town Attorney
Ann Marie Ambrose, Official Stenographer
Deborah Arbolino, Administrative Aide

This meeting was called to order at 7: 00 P.M. by Mr. Mowerson, Chairman.

Hearings on this meeting's agenda, which are made a part of this meeting, were held as noted below:

PUBLISHED ITEMS

APPLICANTS

DECISIONS

NEW ITEMS:

REILLY 70.14 / 1 / 35; R-15 zone	TOTAL SIDE YARD VARIANCE APPROVED	ZBA#11-68
BECKERLE 69.17 / 2 / 46; R-15 zone	SIDE YARD VARIANCE APPROVED	ZBA#11-69
WALKLEY 68.16 / 5 / 36; RG zone	FRONT YARD VARIANCE APPROVED	ZBA#11-70
568 ROUTE 303 70.14 / 4 / 19; LO zone	CONTINUED	ZBA#11-71
DIUBALDO 69.18 / 4 / 16; R-15 zone	FLOOR AREA RATIO, FRONT YARD, SIDE YARD AND TOTAL SIDE YARD VARIANCES APPROVED	ZBA#11-72
SULLIVAN 77.08 / 1 / 29; RG zone	FLOOR AREA RATIO, FRONT YARD, SIDE YARD AND BUILDING HEIGHT VARIANCES APPROVED	ZBA#11-73
CUPANI/ PEPE 77.05 / 3 / 47; R-15 zone	FRONT YARD AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE VARIANCES APPROVED	ZBA#11-74
MC NEE 70.13 / 1 / 23.9; R-15 zone	SIDE YARD, REAR YARD AND §VARIANCES APPROVED	ZBA#11-75

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

In response to requests from the Orangetown Planning Board, the Zoning Board of Appeals: RESOLVED, to approve the action of the Acting Chairperson executing on behalf of the Board its consent to the Planning Board acting as Lead Agency for the

State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) coordinated environmental review of actions pursuant to SEQRA Regulations § 617.6 (b)(3) the following applications: Lhotak Site Plan, 867 Route 9W, Upper Grandview, N.Y., 75.05 / 1 / 6; R-22 zone; Dominican College Health Center Expansion Site Plan, 470 Western Highway. Orangeburg, N.Y., 70.18 / 2 / 14; R-40 zone; Logerfo Tree Remediation Plan, 976 Route 9W, Upper Grandview, N.Y. 71.13 / 1 / 6; R-22 zone; and FURTHER RESOLVED, to request to be notified by the Planning Board of SEQRA proceedings, hearings, and determinations with respect to these matters.

THE DECISIONS RELATED TO THE ABOVE HEARINGS are inserted herein and made part of these minutes.

The verbatim minutes, as recorded by the Board's official stenographer for the above hearings, are not transcribed.

There being no further business to come before the Board, on motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

Dated: September 7, 2011

DECISION

TOTAL SIDE YARD VARIANCE APPROVED

To: Michael and Eileen Reilly

ZBA # 11-68

7 Blauvelt Road
Blauvelt, New York 10913

Date: September 7, 2011

FROM: ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS: Town of Orangetown

ZBA# 11-68: Application of Michael and Eileen Reilly for a variance from Chapter 43 (Zoning) Section 3.12, R-15 District, Group M, Column 10 (Total Side yard: 50' required, 41.1' proposed) for an addition to an existing single-family residence.. The premises are located at 7 Blauvelt Road, Blauvelt, New York an identified on the Orangetown tax Map as Section 70.14, Block 1, Lot 35; R-15 zoning district.

Heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Orangetown at a meeting held on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at which time the Board made the determination hereinafter set forth.

Michael and Eileen Reilly and Robert Hoene, Architect, appeared and testified.

The following documents were presented:

1. Site plan dated 07/12/2011 signed and sealed by Robert Hoene, Architect.
2. Architectural plans dated 04/15/2011 with the latest revision date of 05/10/2011 signed and sealed by Robert Hoene, Architect.
3. A letter dated August 16, 2011 from the County of Rockland Department of Planning signed by Thomas Vanderbeek, P.E., Commissioner of Planning.
4. A letter dated July 18, 2011 from the County of Rockland Department of Health signed by Scott McKane, P.E., Senior Public Health Engineer.
5. A letter dated July 27, 2011 from the County of Rockland Department of Highways signed by Joseph Arena, Principal Engineering Technician.
6. A letter dated August 26, 2011 from the County of Rockland Sewer District No. 1

signed by Joseph LaFiandra, Engineer II.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to open the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

On advice of Dennis Michaels, Deputy Town Attorney, counsel to the Zoning Board of Appeals, Mr. Mowerson moved for a Board determination that the foregoing application is a Type II action exempt from the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), pursuant to SEQRA Regulations §617.5 (c) (9), (10), (12) and /or (13); which does not require SEQRA environmental review. The motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

Robert Hoene, Architect, testified that the applicants have four children and a three bedroom house; that the house has a two story element and a 1 ½ story element; that they are proposing to add a master bedroom, closets and a master bath in between these two elements; that the total side yard is not changing; that they are before the board to reaffirm the existing total side yard.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

The Board members made personal inspections of the premises the week before the meeting and found them to be properly posted and as generally described on the application.

A satisfactory statement in accordance with the provisions of Section 809 of the General Municipal Law of New York was received.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to close the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS:

After personal observation of the property, hearing all the testimony and reviewing all the documents submitted, the Board found and concluded that the benefits to the applicant if the variance(s) are granted outweigh the detriment (if any) to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant, for the following reasons:

1. The requested total side yard variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. The total side yard is not changing, the middle area of the house is being filled in with a second floor addition.
2. The requested total side yard variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The total side yard is not changing, the middle area of the house is being filled in with a second floor addition.
3. The benefits sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by other means feasible for the applicant to pursue other than by obtaining variances.
4. The requested total side yard variance is not substantial, and will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the area. The total side yard is not changing, the middle area of the house is being filled in with a second floor addition.
5. The applicant purchased the property subject to Orangetown's Zoning Code (Chapter 43) and is proposing a new addition and/or improvements, so the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration was relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but did not, by itself, preclude the granting of the area variances.

DECISION: In view of the foregoing and the testimony and documents presented, the Board: RESOLVED, that the application for the requested total side yard variance is APPROVED; and FURTHER RESOLVED, that such decision and the vote thereon shall become effective and be deemed rendered on the date of adoption by the Board of the minutes of which they are a part.

General Conditions:

(i) The approval of any variance or Special Permit is granted by the Board in accordance with and subject to those facts shown on the plans submitted and, if applicable, as amended at or prior to this hearing, as hereinabove recited or set forth.

(ii) Any approval of a variance or Special Permit by the Board is limited to the specific variance or Special Permit requested but only to the extent such approval is granted herein and subject to those conditions, if any, upon which such approval was conditioned which are hereinbefore set forth.

(iii) The Board gives no approval of any building plans, including, without limitation, the accuracy and structural integrity thereof, of the applicant, but same have been submitted to the Board solely for informational and verification purposes relative to any variances being requested.

(iv) A building permit as well as any other necessary permits must be obtained within a reasonable period of time following the filing of this decision and prior to undertaking any construction contemplated in this decision. To the extent any variance or Special Permit granted herein is subject to any conditions, the building department shall not be obligated to issue any necessary permits where any such condition imposed should, in the sole judgment of the building department, be first complied with as contemplated hereunder. Occupancy will not be made until, and unless, a Certificate of Occupancy is issued by the Office of Building, Zoning and Planning Administration and Enforcement which legally permits such occupancy.

(v) Any foregoing variance or Special Permit will lapse if any contemplated construction of the project or any use for which the variance or Special Permit is granted is not substantially implemented within one year of the date of filing of this decision or that of any other board of the Town of Orangetown granting any required final approval to such project, whichever is later, but in any event within two years of the filing of this decision. Merely obtaining a Building Permit with respect to construction or a Certificate of Occupancy with respect to use does not constitute "substantial implementation" for the purposes hereof.

The foregoing resolution to approve the application for the requested total side yard variance was presented and moved by Ms. Albanese, seconded by Mr. Mowerson and carried as follows: Ms. Castelli, aye; Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

The Administrative Aide to the Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign this decision and file a certified copy thereof in the office of the Town Clerk.

DATED: September 7, 2011

DECISION

SIDE YARD VARIANCE APPROVED

To: Matthew Beckerle

ZBA # 11-69

64 Mountainview Avenue
Pearl River, New York 10965

Date: September 7, 2011

FROM: ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS: Town of Orangetown

ZBA#11-69: Application of Matthew Beckerle for a variance from Chapter 43 (Zoning), Section 3.12, Group M, R-15 District, Column 9 (Side Yard: 20' required, 14.9' proposed) for a proposed addition to an existing single-family residence. Premises are located at 64 Mountainview Avenue, Pearl River, New York and are identified on the Orangetown Tax Map as Section 69.17, Block 2, Lot 46; R-15 zoning district.

Heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Orangetown at a meeting held on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at which time the Board made the determination hereinafter set forth.

Jean and Matthew Beckerle appeared and testified.

The following documents were presented:

1. Architectural plans dated 03/26/2011 signed and sealed by Harry Goldstein, Architect.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to open the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

On advice of Dennis Michaels, Deputy Town Attorney, counsel to the Zoning Board of Appeals, Mr. Mowerson moved for a Board determination that the foregoing application is a Type II action exempt from the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), pursuant to SEQRA Regulations §617.5 (c) (9), (10), (12) and /or (13); which does not require SEQRA environmental review. The motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

Jean Beckerle testified that they are proposing to bump out the back side of the house and square off the kitchen and sunroom and bring out the side entrance for easier access ; that the property is on the corner of Orangeburg Road and Mountainview Avenue; that the property is steep and this new entrance will permit easier safer access to the house.

Matthew Beckerle testified that the driveway and garage are below the hill and to enter the house they go up hill on steep steps and would like to change that to make it safer; that the house is not centered on the property; that they are not changing or modifying the front the house; that the house was built in 1926; that they are adding a deck for the grill and that the side yard closest to the proposal would be 14.9' but the nearest neighbor's side yard is an additional about 20'; that the neighbors house faces Mountainview Avenue.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

The Board members made personal inspections of the premises the week before the meeting and found them to be properly posted and as generally described on the application.

A satisfactory statement in accordance with the provisions of Section 809 of the General Municipal Law of New York was received.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to close the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS:

After personal observation of the property, hearing all the testimony and reviewing all the documents submitted, the Board found and concluded that the benefits to the applicant if the variance(s) are granted outweigh the detriment (if any) to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant, for the following reasons:

1. The requested side yard variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. The existing house was built in 1926 in the corner of the lot which causes the need for a side yard variance.
2. The requested side yard variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The existing house was built in 1926 in the corner of the lot which causes the need for a side yard variance.
3. The benefits sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by other means feasible for the applicant to pursue other than by obtaining a variance.
4. The requested side yard variance, is not substantial, and will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the area. The existing house was built in 1926 in the corner of the lot which causes the need for a side yard variance.
5. The applicant purchased the property subject to Orangetown's Zoning Code (Chapter 43) and is proposing a new addition and/or improvements, so the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration was relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but did not, by itself, preclude the granting of the area variances.

DECISION: In view of the foregoing and the testimony and documents presented, the Board: **RESOLVED**, that the application for the requested side yard variance is **APPROVED**; and **FURTHER RESOLVED**, that such decision and the vote thereon shall become effective and be deemed rendered on the date of adoption by the Board of the minutes of which they are a part.

General Conditions:

(i) The approval of any variance or Special Permit is granted by the Board in accordance with and subject to those facts shown on the plans submitted and, if applicable, as amended at or prior to this hearing, as hereinabove recited or set forth.

(ii) Any approval of a variance or Special Permit by the Board is limited to the specific variance or Special Permit requested but only to the extent such approval is granted herein and subject to those conditions, if any, upon which such approval was conditioned which are hereinbefore set forth.

(iii) The Board gives no approval of any building plans, including, without limitation, the accuracy and structural integrity thereof, of the applicant, but same have been submitted to the Board solely for informational and verification purposes relative to any variances being requested.

(iv) A building permit as well as any other necessary permits must be obtained within a reasonable period of time following the filing of this decision and prior to undertaking any construction contemplated in this decision. To the extent any variance or Special

Permit granted herein is subject to any conditions, the building department shall not be obligated to issue any necessary permits where any such condition imposed should, in the sole judgment of the building department, be first complied with as contemplated hereunder. Occupancy will not be made until, and unless, a Certificate of Occupancy is issued by the Office of Building, Zoning and Planning Administration and Enforcement which legally permits such occupancy.

(v) Any foregoing variance or Special Permit will lapse if any contemplated construction of the project or any use for which the variance or Special Permit is granted is not substantially implemented within one year of the date of filing of this decision or that of any other board of the Town of Orangetown granting any required final approval to such project, whichever is later, but in any event within two years of the filing of this decision. Merely obtaining a Building Permit with respect to construction or a Certificate of Occupancy with respect to use does not constitute "substantial implementation" for the purposes hereof.

The foregoing resolution to approve the application for the requested side yard variance was presented and moved by Ms. Salomon, seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; Mr. Warren, aye; . Ms. Salomon, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

The Administrative Aide to the Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign this decision and file a certified copy thereof in the office of the Town Clerk.

DATED: September 7, 2011

DECISION

FRONT YARD VARIANCE APPROVED

To: Robert and Dlorah Walkley
72 Roosevelt Street
Pearl River, New York 10965

ZBA # 11-70

Date: September 7, 2011

FROM: ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS: Town of Orangetown

ZBA# 11-70: Application of Robert Walkley for a variance from Chapter 43 (Zoning), RG District, Group Q, Column 8 (Front Yard: 25' required, 10.8' existing, 6.4' & 11.5' proposed), applicant has two front yards; for an addition to an existing single-family residence. The premises are located at 72 Roosevelt Street, Pearl River, New York an identified on the Orangetown tax Map as Section 68.16, Block 5, Lot 36; RG zoning district.

Heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Orangetown at a meeting held on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at which time the Board made the determination hereinafter set forth.

Michael and Eileen Reilly and Robert Hoene, Architect, appeared and testified.

The following documents were presented:

1. Site plan dated 11/08/1985 with the latest revision date of April 27, 2011 signed and sealed by Robert Sorace, LS.
2. Architectural plans dated 02/24/2011 signed and sealed by Douglas Siebenaler, Architect.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to open the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

On advice of Dennis Michaels, Deputy Town Attorney, counsel to the Zoning Board of Appeals, Mr. Mowerson moved for a Board determination that the foregoing application is a Type II action exempt from the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), pursuant to SEQRA Regulations §617.5 (c) (9), (10), (12) and /or (13); which does not require SEQRA environmental review. The motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

Robert Walkley testified that they are squaring off the back corner of the house to add a full handicap accessible bath, an addition to the kitchen, a deck and Bilco doors for the basement; that the entrance to the house that is used is the one on the side by the garage; that the covered deck would make the entrance safer; and that they have two front yards.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

The Board members made personal inspections of the premises the week before the meeting and found them to be properly posted and as generally described on the application.

A satisfactory statement in accordance with the provisions of Section 809 of the General Municipal Law of New York was received.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to close the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS:

After personal observation of the property, hearing all the testimony and reviewing all the documents submitted, the Board found and concluded that the benefits to the applicant if the variance(s) are granted outweigh the detriment (if any) to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant, for the following reasons:

1. The requested front yard variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. The requested front yard variance is less than the pre-existing non-conforming front yard.
2. The requested front yard variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The requested front yard variance is less than the pre-existing non-conforming front yard.
3. The benefits sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by other means feasible for the applicant to pursue other than by obtaining variances.
4. The requested front yard variance, is not substantial, and will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the area. The requested front yard variance is less than the pre-existing non-conforming front yard.
5. The applicant purchased the property subject to Orangetown's Zoning Code (Chapter 43) and is proposing a new addition and/or improvements, so the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration was relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but did not, by itself, preclude the granting of the area variances.

DECISION: In view of the foregoing and the testimony and documents presented, the Board: RESOLVED, that the application for the requested front yard variance is APPROVED; and FURTHER RESOLVED, that such decision and the vote thereon shall become effective and be deemed rendered on the date of adoption by the Board of the minutes of which they are a part.

General Conditions:

(i) The approval of any variance or Special Permit is granted by the Board in accordance with and subject to those facts shown on the plans submitted and, if applicable, as amended at or prior to this hearing, as hereinabove recited or set forth.

(ii) Any approval of a variance or Special Permit by the Board is limited to the specific variance or Special Permit requested but only to the extent such approval is granted herein and subject to those conditions, if any, upon which such approval was conditioned which are hereinbefore set forth.

(iii) The Board gives no approval of any building plans, including, without limitation, the accuracy and structural integrity thereof, of the applicant, but same have been submitted to the Board solely for informational and verification purposes relative to any variances being requested.

(iv) A building permit as well as any other necessary permits must be obtained within a reasonable period of time following the filing of this decision and prior to undertaking any construction contemplated in this decision. To the extent any variance or Special Permit granted herein is subject to any conditions, the building department shall not be obligated to issue any necessary permits where any such condition imposed should, in the sole judgment of the building department, be first complied with as contemplated hereunder. Occupancy will not be made until, and unless, a Certificate of Occupancy is issued by the Office of Building, Zoning and Planning Administration and Enforcement which legally permits such occupancy.

(v) Any foregoing variance or Special Permit will lapse if any contemplated construction of the project or any use for which the variance or Special Permit is granted is not substantially implemented within one year of the date of filing of this decision or that of any other board of the Town of Orangetown granting any required final approval to such project, whichever is later, but in any event within two years of the filing of this decision. Merely obtaining a Building Permit with respect to construction or a Certificate of Occupancy with respect to use does not constitute "substantial implementation" for the purposes hereof.

The foregoing resolution to approve the application for the requested front yard variance was presented and moved by Mr. Warren, seconded by Ms. Salomon and carried as follows: Ms. Castelli, aye; Mr. Warren, aye; .Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

The Administrative Aide to the Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign this decision and file a certified copy thereof in the office of the Town Clerk.

DATED: September 7, 2011

DECISION

FLOOR AREA RATIO, FRONT YARD, SIDE YARD, AND TOTAL SIDE YARD
VARIANCES APPROVED

To: Robert and Trudi Diubaldo

ZBA # 11-72

30 Haven Terrace
Pearl River, New York 10965

Date: September 7, 2011

FROM: ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS: Town of Orangetown

ZBA#11-72: Application of Robert and Trudi Diubaldo for variances from Chapter 43 (Zoning), Section 3.12, R-15 District, Group M, Columns 4 (Floor Area Ratio: .20 permitted, .377 existing, .416 proposed), 8 (Front Yard: 30' required, 22' proposed), 9 (Side Yard: 15' required, 11.9' & 11.7' existing, 12.9' & 12.7' proposed), and 10 (Total Side Yard: 30' required, 23.6' existing & proposed, no change) for an addition to an existing single-family residence. The premises are located at 30 Haven Terrace, Pearl River, New York and are identified on the Orangetown Tax Map as Section 69.18, Block 4, Lot 16 in the R-15 zoning district.

Heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Orangetown at a meeting held on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at which time the Board made the determination hereinafter set forth.

Robert and Trudi Diubaldo and John Atzl, Land Surveyor, appeared and testified.

The following documents were presented:

1. Site plan dated 05/16/2011 signed and sealed by John Atzl, LS.
2. Architectural plans dated 05/16/2011 by Hess Architects.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to open the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

On advice of Dennis Michaels, Deputy Town Attorney, counsel to the Zoning Board of Appeals, Mr. Mowerson moved for a Board determination that the foregoing application is a Type II action exempt from the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), pursuant to SEQRA Regulations §617.5 (c) (9), (10), (12) and /or (13); which does not require SEQRA environmental review. The motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

John Atzl, Land Surveyor, testified that the applicant has lived in the house since 1984; that they raised their family there and love the house and the neighborhood; that they are proposing to add a covered front porch because the south side of the house is too hot; that they have large, tall windows in the rear of the house and cannot add a movable awning because of them; that the patio area is just too hot to use during the summer months; that they would like a sheltered area for a small table to be able to sit outside and have coffee in the morning; that the proposed eight foot wide porch would afford them that opportunity; that the house was built on an extremely undersized lot for the zone; that the front steps are in need of repair; that the road is 20' wide with an additional 10' from the edge of road to the property line; and that there will be some dead space by the front door but the porch will have symmetry the way it is designed.

Robert Diubaldo testified that front porches are not uncommon in the area; that they have the smallest lot on the block; that without the eight foot width they would not be able to place furniture and use the porch; and that the porch will not be out of character for the neighborhood.

Trudi Diubaldo testified that the rear of the house is full sun and without an awning is unusable for a large portion of the year.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

The Board members made personal inspections of the premises the week before the meeting and found them to be properly posted and as generally described on the application.

A satisfactory statement in accordance with the provisions of Section 809 of the General Municipal Law of New York was received.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to close the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS:

After personal observation of the property, hearing all the testimony and reviewing all the documents submitted, the Board found and concluded that the benefits to the applicant if the variance(s) are granted outweigh the detriment (if any) to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant, for the following reasons:

1. The requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and total side yard variances will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. The existing non-conforming side yard is larger than the requested side yard variance. The lot is undersized by 10,000 sq. ft. which makes the floor area ratio seem very large, but the house is not large and similar front porches exist in the neighborhood.
2. The requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and total side yard variances will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The existing non-conforming side yard is larger than the requested side yard variance. The lot is undersized by 10,000 sq. ft. which makes the floor area ratio seem very large, but the house is not large and similar front porches exist in the neighborhood.
3. The benefits sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by other means feasible for the applicant to pursue other than by obtaining variances.
4. The requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and total side yard variances are not substantial, and will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the area. The existing non-conforming side yard is larger than the requested side yard variance. The lot is undersized by 10,000 sq. ft. which makes the floor area ratio seem very large, but the house is not large and similar front porches exist in the neighborhood.
5. The applicant purchased the property subject to Orangetown's Zoning Code (Chapter 43) and is proposing a new addition and/or improvements, so the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration was relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but did not, by itself, preclude the granting of the area variances.

DECISION: In view of the foregoing and the testimony and documents presented, the Board: **RESOLVED**, that the application for the requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and total side yard variance is **APPROVED**; and **FURTHER RESOLVED**, that such decision and the vote thereon shall become effective and be deemed rendered on the date of adoption by the Board of the minutes of which they are a part.

General Conditions:

- (i) The approval of any variance or Special Permit is granted by the Board in accordance

with and subject to those facts shown on the plans submitted and, if applicable, as amended at or prior to this hearing, as hereinabove recited or set forth.

(ii) Any approval of a variance or Special Permit by the Board is limited to the specific variance or Special Permit requested but only to the extent such approval is granted herein and subject to those conditions, if any, upon which such approval was conditioned which are hereinbefore set forth.

(iii) The Board gives no approval of any building plans, including, without limitation, the accuracy and structural integrity thereof, of the applicant, but same have been submitted to the Board solely for informational and verification purposes relative to any variances being requested.

(iv) A building permit as well as any other necessary permits must be obtained within a reasonable period of time following the filing of this decision and prior to undertaking any construction contemplated in this decision. To the extent any variance or Special Permit granted herein is subject to any conditions, the building department shall not be obligated to issue any necessary permits where any such condition imposed should, in the sole judgment of the building department, be first complied with as contemplated hereunder. Occupancy will not be made until, and unless, a Certificate of Occupancy is issued by the Office of Building, Zoning and Planning Administration and Enforcement which legally permits such occupancy.

(v) Any foregoing variance or Special Permit will lapse if any contemplated construction of the project or any use for which the variance or Special Permit is granted is not substantially implemented within one year of the date of filing of this decision or that of any other board of the Town of Orangetown granting any required final approval to such project, whichever is later, but in any event within two years of the filing of this decision. Merely obtaining a Building Permit with respect to construction or a Certificate of Occupancy with respect to use does not constitute "substantial implementation" for the purposes hereof.

The foregoing resolution to approve the application for the requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and total side yard variances was presented and moved by Ms. Castelli, seconded by Mr. Mowerson and carried as follows: Ms. Castelli, aye; Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

The Administrative Aide to the Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign this decision and file a certified copy thereof in the office of the Town Clerk.

DATED: September 7, 2011

DECISION

FLOOR AREA RATIO, FRONT YARD, SIDE YARD AND BUILDING HEIGHT VARIANCES APPROVED

To: Kenneth and Laura Sullivan

ZBA # 11-73

70 Eimer Street

Date: September 7, 2011

Tappan, New York 10983

FROM: ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS: Town of Orangetown

ZBA#11-73: Application of Kenneth and Laura Sullivan for variances from Chapter 43 (Zoning), Section 3.12, RG District, Group Q, Columns 4 (Floor Area Ratio: .30 permitted, .316 proposed), 8 (Front Yard: 25' required, 20.6' proposed), 9 (Side Yard:

10' required, 5.8' existing, 6.8' proposed), and 12 (Building Height: 9.04' permitted, 12.5' proposed) for an addition to an existing single-family residence. Premises are located at 70 Eimer Street, Tappan, New York and identified on the Orangetown Tax Map as Section 77.08, Block 1, Lot 29; in the RG zoning district.

Heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Orangetown at a meeting held on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at which time the Board made the determination hereinafter set forth.

Kenneth Sullivan appeared and testified.

The following documents were presented:

1. Plot plan with proposed porch drawn on it.
2. Three pages hand drawn sketches of the proposed porch.
3. Zoning Board of Appeals Decision #85-82.
4. Twenty one pictures of the house and houses in the area with front porches.
5. A letter of support from an abutting property owner.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to open the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

On advice of Dennis Michaels, Deputy Town Attorney, counsel to the Zoning Board of Appeals, Mr. Mowerson moved for a Board determination that the foregoing application is a Type II action exempt from the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), pursuant to SEQRA Regulations §617.5 (c) (9), (10), (12) and /or (13); which does not require SEQRA environmental review. The motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

Kenneth Sullivan testified that he would like to add a covered porch to the front of his house that would be 6'6" deep and 32' long; that the house was built in 1954 on a corner lot; that there is a twenty foot easement on the front of his property to the street edge which makes it look like the front yard is wider than it actually is; that aesthetically it would enhance the house and the neighborhood; that there are 13 other houses in the neighborhood with front porches; that he had planned on looking at their files to see if any of them were granted variances but he works for Orange & Rockland and because of the storm has been working 16 hour days and did not get time to investigate the variances; that he has a 2 ½ year old daughter and the bus stop is in front of his house; that he has a water problem in the basement and the addition of the porch might push the water table away from the basement; that he originally considered a 7 ½ foot wide porch but then he found out that he needed a front yard variance so he cut the proposed porch back to 6 ½ feet wide.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

The Board members made personal inspections of the premises the week before the meeting and found them to be properly posted and as generally described on the application.

A satisfactory statement in accordance with the provisions of Section 809 of the General Municipal Law of New York was received.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to close the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS:

After personal observation of the property, hearing all the testimony and reviewing all the documents submitted, the Board found and concluded that the benefits to the applicant if

the variance(s) are granted outweigh the detriment (if any) to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant, for the following reasons:

1. The requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and building height variances will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Similar front porches have been constructed in the area.
2. The requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and building height variances will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. Similar front porches have been constructed in the area.
3. The benefits sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by other means feasible for the applicant to pursue other than by obtaining variances.
4. The requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and building height variances, are not substantial, and will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the area. Similar front porches have been constructed in the area.
5. The applicant purchased the property subject to Orangetown's Zoning Code (Chapter 43) and is proposing a new addition and/or improvements, so the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration was relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but did not, by itself, preclude the granting of the area variances.

DECISION: In view of the foregoing and the testimony and documents presented, the Board: RESOLVED, that the application for the requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and building height variances are APPROVED; and FURTHER RESOLVED, that such decision and the vote thereon shall become effective and be deemed rendered on the date of adoption by the Board of the minutes of which they are a part.

General Conditions:

(i) The approval of any variance or Special Permit is granted by the Board in accordance with and subject to those facts shown on the plans submitted and, if applicable, as amended at or prior to this hearing, as hereinabove recited or set forth.

(ii) Any approval of a variance or Special Permit by the Board is limited to the specific variance or Special Permit requested but only to the extent such approval is granted herein and subject to those conditions, if any, upon which such approval was conditioned which are hereinbefore set forth.

(iii) The Board gives no approval of any building plans, including, without limitation, the accuracy and structural integrity thereof, of the applicant, but same have been submitted to the Board solely for informational and verification purposes relative to any variances being requested.

(iv) A building permit as well as any other necessary permits must be obtained within a reasonable period of time following the filing of this decision and prior to undertaking any construction contemplated in this decision. To the extent any variance or Special Permit granted herein is subject to any conditions, the building department shall not be obligated to issue any necessary permits where any such condition imposed should, in the sole judgment of the building department, be first complied with as contemplated hereunder. Occupancy will not be made until, and unless, a Certificate of Occupancy is issued by the Office of Building, Zoning and Planning Administration and Enforcement which legally permits such occupancy.

(v) Any foregoing variance or Special Permit will lapse if any contemplated construction of the project or any use for which the variance or Special Permit is granted is not substantially implemented within one year of the date of filing of this decision or that of any other board of the Town of Orangetown granting any required final approval to such project, whichever is later, but in any event within two years of the filing of this decision. Merely obtaining a Building Permit with respect to construction or a Certificate of Occupancy with respect to use does not constitute "substantial implementation" for the purposes hereof.

The foregoing resolution to approve the application for the requested floor area ratio, front yard, side yard and building height variances was presented and moved by Ms. Albanese, seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Ms. Salomon, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

The Administrative Aide to the Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign this decision and file a certified copy thereof in the office of the Town Clerk.

DATED: September 7, 2011

DECISION

FRONT YARD AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE VARIANCES APPROVED

To: Nancy Cupani

ZBA # 11-74

71 Eagle Lane
Tappan, New York 10983

Date: September 7, 2011

FROM: ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS: Town of Orangetown

ZBA#11-74: Application of Cupani/ Pepe for variances from Chapter 43 (Zoning), Section 3.12, R-15 District, Group M, Columns 8 (Front Yard: 30' required, 28.3' existing to house; 26.3' to front porch) and from Section 5.227 (Accessory Structure: 5' side yard required, 1.2' existing for shed) for a front porch that was built an existing single-family residence. Premises are located at 71 Eagle Lane, Tappan, New York and identified on the Orangetown Tax Map as Section 77.05, Block 3, Lot 47; in the R-15 zoning district.

Heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Orangetown at a meeting held on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at which time the Board made the determination hereinafter set forth.

Nancy and Robert Cupani and Thomas Pepe appeared and testified.

The following documents were presented:

1. Survey dated 07/11/2011 signed and sealed by Stephen F. Hoppe, PLS.
2. Zoning board of Appeals Decision #04-62 dated 05/19/2004.
3. Nine pictures of the house and porch.
4. A letter in support of the application signed by 14 abutting property owners.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to open the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

On advice of Dennis Michaels, Deputy Town Attorney, counsel to the Zoning Board of

Appeals, Mr. Mowerson moved for a Board determination that the foregoing application is a Type II action exempt from the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), pursuant to SEQRA Regulations §617.5 (c) (9), (10), (12) and /or (13); which does not require SEQRA environmental review. The motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

Nancy Cupani testified that she and her husband are going through a divorce and because of this are selling the house; that they have people interested in purchasing the house and when the title search was done on the property they found out that they do not have a certificate of occupancy for the porch; that the contractor did not get all of the inspections and the survey was not correct; that they had the porch inspected; that they have the electrical inspection and they need to correct the variances that were granted in order to get a certificate of occupancy; and that the shed has been in its present location for at least thirty years; and she would rather not move it because it may not survive a move and the purchasers would be upset.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

The Board members made personal inspections of the premises the week before the meeting and found them to be properly posted and as generally described on the application.

A satisfactory statement in accordance with the provisions of Section 809 of the General Municipal Law of New York was received.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to close the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Albanese and carried unanimously.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS:

After personal observation of the property, hearing all the testimony and reviewing all the documents submitted, the Board found and concluded that the benefits to the applicant if the variance(s) are granted outweigh the detriment (if any) to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant, for the following reasons:

1. The requested front yard and accessory structure variances will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. The front porch has existed since 2004 without incident and the existing shed might not survive the move to put into compliance.
2. The requested front yard and accessory structure variances will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The front porch has existed since 2004 without incident and the existing shed might not survive the move to put into compliance.
3. The benefits sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by other means feasible for the applicant to pursue other than by obtaining variances.
4. The requested front yard and accessory structure variances, although substantial, will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the area. Similar front porches exist in the neighborhood.
5. The applicant purchased the property subject to Orangetown's Zoning Code (Chapter 43) and is proposing a new addition and/or improvements, so the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration was relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but did not, by itself, preclude the granting of the area variances.

DECISION: In view of the foregoing and the testimony and documents presented, the Board: RESOLVED, that the application for the requested front yard and accessory structure variances are APPROVED; and FURTHER RESOLVED, that such decision and the vote thereon shall become effective and be deemed rendered on the date of adoption by the Board of the minutes of which they are a part.

General Conditions:

(i) The approval of any variance or Special Permit is granted by the Board in accordance with and subject to those facts shown on the plans submitted and, if applicable, as amended at or prior to this hearing, as hereinabove recited or set forth.

(ii) Any approval of a variance or Special Permit by the Board is limited to the specific variance or Special Permit requested but only to the extent such approval is granted herein and subject to those conditions, if any, upon which such approval was conditioned which are hereinbefore set forth.

(iii) The Board gives no approval of any building plans, including, without limitation, the accuracy and structural integrity thereof, of the applicant, but same have been submitted to the Board solely for informational and verification purposes relative to any variances being requested.

(iv) A building permit as well as any other necessary permits must be obtained within a reasonable period of time following the filing of this decision and prior to undertaking any construction contemplated in this decision. To the extent any variance or Special Permit granted herein is subject to any conditions, the building department shall not be obligated to issue any necessary permits where any such condition imposed should, in the sole judgment of the building department, be first complied with as contemplated hereunder. Occupancy will not be made until, and unless, a Certificate of Occupancy is issued by the Office of Building, Zoning and Planning Administration and Enforcement which legally permits such occupancy.

(v) Any foregoing variance or Special Permit will lapse if any contemplated construction of the project or any use for which the variance or Special Permit is granted is not substantially implemented within one year of the date of filing of this decision or that of any other board of the Town of Orangetown granting any required final approval to such project, whichever is later, but in any event within two years of the filing of this decision. Merely obtaining a Building Permit with respect to construction or a Certificate of Occupancy with respect to use does not constitute "substantial implementation" for the purposes hereof.

The foregoing resolution to approve the application for the requested front yard and accessory structure variances was presented and moved by Ms. Salomon, seconded by Ms. Albanese and carried as follows: Ms. Castelli, aye; Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

The Administrative Aide to the Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign this decision and file a certified copy thereof in the office of the Town Clerk.

DATED: September 7, 2011

DECISION

SIDE YARD, REAR YARD AND SECTION 5.227 VARIANCES APPROVED

To: Michael and Karen McNee

ZBA # 11-75

18 Private Delregno Court
Blauvelt, New York 10913

Date: September 7, 2011

FROM: ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS: Town of Orangetown

ZBA#11-75: Application of Michael and Karen McNee for variances from Chapter 43 (Zoning), Section 3.12, R-15 District, Group M, Columns 9 (Side Yard: 20' required, 10' proposed for pool), 11 (Rear Yard: 35' required, 21.2' existing for existing deck) and from Section 5.227 (Swimming Pool: 20' rear yard required, 15' proposed) for an existing deck and proposed in-ground swimming pool at an existing single-family residence. Premises are located at 18 Private Delregno Court, Blauvelt, New York and identified on the Orangetown Tax Map as Section 70.13, Block 1, Lot 23.9; in the R-15 zoning district.

Heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Orangetown at a meeting held on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at which time the Board made the determination hereinafter set forth.

Michael and Karen McNee and Lenny Lesin, Penguin Pools, appeared and testified.

The following documents were presented:

1. Survey dated July 18, 2011 with the latest revision date of August 2, 2011 signed and sealed by Anthony R. Celentano, PLS.
2. Pool plans signed and sealed by Donald P. Schlachter, P.E.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to open the Public Hearing which motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried unanimously.

On advice of Dennis Michaels, Deputy Town Attorney, counsel to the Zoning Board of Appeals, Mr. Mowerson moved for a Board determination that the foregoing application is a Type II action exempt from the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), pursuant to SEQRA Regulations §617.5 (c) (9), (10), (12) and /or (13); which does not require SEQRA environmental review. The motion was seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Ms. Salomon, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

Ms. Castelli disclosed that she works with Karen McNee; that their working relationship would not influence her decision regarding their application.

Lenny Lesin, Penguin Pools testified that they are proposing to install an in-ground pool at 18 Private Delregno Court; that when they made the application for the pool they found out that the contractor that installed the deck did not get all of the proper inspections and that the deck did not have a certificate of occupancy; that they are before the Board for the variances for the pool and the existing deck; and that there is more than eight feet between the pool and the existing deck.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

The Board members made personal inspections of the premises the week before the meeting and found them to be properly posted and as generally described on the application.

A satisfactory statement in accordance with the provisions of Section 809 of the General Municipal Law of New York was received.

Mr. Mowerson made a motion to close the Public Hearing which motion was seconded

by Ms. Albanese and carried unanimously.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS:

After personal observation of the property, hearing all the testimony and reviewing all the documents submitted, the Board found and concluded that the benefits to the applicant if the variance(s) are granted outweigh the detriment (if any) to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant, for the following reasons:

1. The requested side yard, rear yard and §5.227 variances will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Similar pools have been installed in the neighborhood.
2. The requested side yard, rear yard, and §5.227 variances will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. Similar pools have been installed in the neighborhood.
3. The benefits sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by other means feasible for the applicant to pursue other than by obtaining variances.
4. The requested side yard, rear yard and §5.227 variances, although substantial, will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the area. Similar pools have been installed in the neighborhood.
5. The applicant purchased the property subject to Orangetown's Zoning Code (Chapter 43) and is proposing a new addition and/or improvements, so the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration was relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but did not, by itself, preclude the granting of the area variances.

DECISION: In view of the foregoing and the testimony and documents presented, the Board: **RESOLVED**, that the application for the requested side yard, rear yard, and Section 5.227 variances are **APPROVED**; and **FURTHER RESOLVED**, that such decision and the vote thereon shall become effective and be deemed rendered on the date of adoption by the Board of the minutes of which they are a part.

General Conditions:

(i) The approval of any variance or Special Permit is granted by the Board in accordance with and subject to those facts shown on the plans submitted and, if applicable, as amended at or prior to this hearing, as hereinabove recited or set forth.

(ii) Any approval of a variance or Special Permit by the Board is limited to the specific variance or Special Permit requested but only to the extent such approval is granted herein and subject to those conditions, if any, upon which such approval was conditioned which are hereinbefore set forth.

(iii) The Board gives no approval of any building plans, including, without limitation, the accuracy and structural integrity thereof, of the applicant, but same have been submitted to the Board solely for informational and verification purposes relative to any variances being requested.

(iv) A building permit as well as any other necessary permits must be obtained within a reasonable period of time following the filing of this decision and prior to undertaking any construction contemplated in this decision. To the extent any variance or Special Permit granted herein is subject to any conditions, the building department shall not be

obligated to issue any necessary permits where any such condition imposed should, in the sole judgment of the building department, be first complied with as contemplated hereunder. Occupancy will not be made until, and unless, a Certificate of Occupancy is issued by the Office of Building, Zoning and Planning Administration and Enforcement which legally permits such occupancy.

(v) Any foregoing variance or Special Permit will lapse if any contemplated construction of the project or any use for which the variance or Special Permit is granted is not substantially implemented within one year of the date of filing of this decision or that of any other board of the Town of Orangetown granting any required final approval to such project, whichever is later, but in any event within two years of the filing of this decision. Merely obtaining a Building Permit with respect to construction or a Certificate of Occupancy with respect to use does not constitute "substantial implementation" for the purposes hereof.

The foregoing resolution to approve the application for the requested side yard, rear yard and Section 5.227 variances was presented and moved by Mr. Warren, seconded by Ms. Castelli and carried as follows: Mr. Warren, aye; Ms. Albanese, aye; Ms. Castelli, aye; Ms. Salomon, aye; and Mr. Mowerson, aye. Mr. Sullivan was absent.

The Administrative Aide to the Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign this decision and file a certified copy thereof in the office of the Town Clerk.

DATED: September 7, 2011

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
TOWN OF ORANGETOWN

By _____
Deborah Arbolino

Administrative Aide

DISTRIBUTION:

APPLICANT
ZBA MEMBERS
SUPERVISOR
TOWN BOARD MEMBERS
TOWN ATTORNEY
DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY
OBZPAE
BUILDING INSPECTOR

TOWN CLERK
HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT
ASSESSOR
DEPT. of ENVIRONMENTAL
MGMT. and ENGINEERING
FILE.ZBA, PB
CHAIRMAN, ZBA, PB, ACABOR

