



Historic Town of Hyde Park
Zoning Board of Appeals
4383 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park, NY 12538
(845) 229-5111, Ext. 2

"Working with you for a better Hyde Park"

MINUTES of
PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING
OF THE HYDE PARK ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Held on April 26, 2023 6:00 PM

Meeting held at Hyde Park Town Hall, 4383 Albany Post Road, Hyde Park, NY

ZBA Board Members in Attendance:

Present Chairman David McNary
Present Vice Chair Gerald Bowen
Present James Agrawal
Present Paul Donnelly
Present Richard Perkins

Others Present:

Sarah Ryan Attorney to the Zoning Board of Appeals
Kathleen Moss Zoning Administrator
Kathleen Hoppe ZBA Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman David McNary opened the meeting and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman McNary acknowledged that April 26th is Administrative Professional's Day, and thanked the ZBA Secretary for her hard work.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:

CHEVEZ

Location: 32 East Market Street, Hyde Park
Grid #: 6065-04-914274

Owner & Applicant: Edis Chevez

Area Variances – Section 108-4.3B(5)(b) Animal Husbandry – to allow animal husbandry to be conducted as close as 171 feet from a residence on another lot where 350 feet is required (or 250 feet without a rooster), and
Section 108-4.3B(5)(d) Animal Husbandry – to permit unenclosed storage of manure as close as 171 feet from a residence on another lot, where 250 feet is required.

Chairman McNary asked for a motion to open the continued public hearing for Chevez. James Agrawal made the motion and Vice Chair Bowen seconded it. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair McNary welcomed the applicant and his family and asked them to be seated at the table for applicants.

Chair McNary: Good evening to you all. We've had two site visits by a number of our Board members. Are there any comments of the Board members? Who attended?

Richard Perkins: The first meeting, Paul, Jerry, and myself were there, and then the second time, you graciously had Jerry and I come over and look, and I appreciate your time and efforts.

Mr. Chevez: Thank you.

Chair McNary: Any observations that you care to share?

Richard Perkins: The second time we were there is because we hadn't done our job the first time, and we missed out on where the waste was. We were very happy to see that it was in an enclosed container.

Mr. Chevez: I'm happy, too. Thank you.

Chair McNary: Others? Paul?

Paul Donnelly: When I was there, I thought it was a nice-looking pen, the chickens were well-kept, I didn't smell any smells, anything like that. It's in the back, it's secluded. I did hear the rooster a couple times, I didn't think it was that loud, but it did make a couple of noises that roosters make.

Chair McNary: *(to Mr. Chevez)* Have you considered anything in terms of the rooster? That seems to be the one issue here. Any decision on that?

Mr. Chevez: Okay.

Chair McNary: We'll need to move the rooster out.

Mr. Chevez: That's fine.

Chair McNary: Okay. I'm sorry about that, but I think in terms of the noise, and where we are – you'll still get eggs. Do we have any public comments? I don't see any [members of the public in attendance}. Have we received any other additional comments?

Kathleen Hoppe: No, we have not.

Chairman McNary made a motion to close the public hearing for Chevez, and Richard Perkins seconded it. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Richard Perkins read the resolution to grant the variance, which was amended at the dais to exclude the variance for unenclosed manure. James Agrawal seconded the motion. The resolution, as amended, was granted by unanimous roll call vote.

Town of Hyde Park
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
4383 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park NY 12538
(845) 229-5111, ext. 2

RESOLUTION TO GRANT AN AREA VARIANCE

Chevez – Animal Husbandry
32 East Market Street
Hyde Park, New York

Date: April 26, 2023

Motion: Richard Perkins

Resolution #23-01Z

Second: James Agrawal

WHEREAS, the applicant, Edis Chevez, has submitted an application for an area variance to allow animal husbandry to be conducted closer to neighboring residences than allowed (the “Project”) at 32 East Market Street, Hyde Park, New York, identified as tax parcel no. 6065-04-914274, in the Neighborhood Zoning District (the “Site”); and

WHEREAS, the Project is depicted on a drawing prepared by Mr. Chevez submitted on or about February 24, 2023, and on a map showing measurements determined by using Dutchess County Parcel Access (the “Aerial Measurements”); and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks an area variance (“Requested Variance”) from Zoning Law Section 108-4.3B(5)(b) to change the distance of the chicken and rooster pen to fourteen residences, from the required minimum of 350 feet (or 250 feet without rooster) to: 171 feet from 13 Church Street (tax grid no. 905257), 183 feet from 30 East Market Street (tax grid no. 905278), 185 feet from 35 East Market Street (tax grid no. 922285), 205 feet from 28 East Market Street (tax grid no. 901279), 216 feet from 33 East Market Street (tax grid no. 920299), 242 feet from 31 East Market Street (tax grid no. 912304), 257 feet from 26 East Market Street (tax grid no. 896278), 267 feet from 29 East Market Street (tax grid no. 905308), 288 feet from 24 East Market Street (tax grid no. 891278), 288 feet from 27 East Market Street (tax grid no. 899309), 313 feet from 39 East Market Street (tax grid no. 945276), 325 feet from 20 East Market Street (tax grid no. 879286), 337 feet from 25 East Market Street (tax grid no. 893309), and 339 feet from 9 Church Street (tax grid no. 879252); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(17), the granting of an area variance for a single-family, two-family or three-family residence is a Type II action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act and is not subject to review under the Act; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was held on March 22, 2023, and continued to April 26, 2023, during duly noticed meetings, during which all those who wished to speak were heard; and

WHEREAS, the applicable standards for considering an area variance are set forth in Town Law Section 267-b and Hyde Park Zoning Law section 108-33.6(B)(2), which require the Board to take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the general neighborhood or community by such grant.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals makes the following findings in accordance with Section 267-b of the Town Law and Hyde Park Zoning Law Section 108-33.6(B)(2) regarding the Requested Variance:

1. The Requested Variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. The applicant applied for animal husbandry of chickens and a rooster. The chickens are out of sight and are contained within a pen located in the woods behind the applicant's house, and the animals are relatively quiet. The noise generated by the chickens is further mitigated by forest cover and insulating topography. In addition, chickens eat bugs and ticks, which will benefit the neighborhood. Roosters will crow to indicate safety for their flock, to communicate their dominance, and to warn of danger. However, husbandry of the rooster may violate Town Law Chapter 75-4M, which specifies that loud birds which disturb the peace are an unreasonable noise and are subject to fines.
2. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than this area variance. Usable area on this site is limited. The applicant has located the chicken pen in the most sensible location. The Chevez family sees benefit in teaching their children animal husbandry of chickens as part of the home environment. The Chevez family shares their eggs with adjoining neighbors.
3. The Zoning Board of Appeals is required to grant the minimum variance necessary. The Requested Variance will be made less substantial by conditioning its approval upon the removal of the rooster, while the applicant will still receive most of the intended benefit. The Requested Variance is not numerically substantial. Animal husbandry with only chickens may be conducted 250 feet from nearby residences, as opposed to 350 feet with the rooster. The removal of the rooster will decrease the number of nearby residences requiring the Requested Variance from fourteen to six.
4. The Requested Variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the general neighborhood or district. The coop is cleaned weekly by the applicant. When the coop is cleaned, the manure is stored in an enclosed container on the applicant's property.
5. The difficulties are self-created. Without approvals, the applicant purchased chickens and a rooster and has participated in animal husbandry for several years. Applicant sought this area variance after receiving a Notice of Violation and Order to Remedy from the Zoning Administrator.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby grants the Requested Variance subject to the following condition(s):

1. Removal of the rooster from 32 East Market Street.
2. The granted variance is specific to chickens only; any change or addition of animals will result in revocation of the variance.
3. Payment of all fees and escrow.

Adopted:

ROLL CALL VOTE BY SECRETARY

James Agrawal YES
Paul Donnelly YES
Richard Perkins YES
Vice Chair Bowen YES
Chairman McNary YES

MOTION CARRIED

Kathleen Hoppe: Chair? I just wanted to remind them of the next step, they still have to seek site plan approval from the Planning Board, I don't know if they're aware of that. That is their next step.

Richard Perkins: Oh, okay.

Chair McNary: Yes. Thank you very much.

Richard Perkins: Are there requirements that we didn't even think about?

K. Moss: No. If they didn't get the variance, it wasn't worth applying to the Planning Board.

Richard Perkins: Okay, sequence. Thank you.

Chair McNary: Okay, so, the application to the Planning Board. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chevez: Thank you.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS:

O'NEALL #23-05Z

Owner & Applicant: Margret A. O'Neill

Location: 24 Fuller Lane, Hyde Park

Grid #: 6065-20-812006

Area Variances – Section 108-5.15 Bulk Regulations in the Neighborhood District and Historic Overlay District

To change the minimum front yard setback from 50 feet to 44 feet on Fuller Lane, and from 50 feet to 38 feet on Garden Street to build a front porch addition and steps, and to change the minimum front yard setback from 50 feet to 29 feet on Garden Street to construct a 20-foot by 16-foot covered porch deck in the rear of the dwelling.

Chairman McNary made a motion to open the public hearing for O'Neill, and Vice Chair Bowen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Margret A. O'Neill sat at the applicant's table.

Chair McNary: Welcome.

Ms. O'Neill: Thank you, it's a pleasure to be here.

Chair McNary: Tell us a little bit about what you're trying to do.

Ms. O'Neill: So, the front [of my house] – the previous owner took the front porch and closed it in to make a closet. It's a wonderful closet, but the house sort of looks like a house with an outhouse stuck on the front of it, if you've driven by the house. I had an architect friend design a front porch adjacent to the existing porch, because the owner had moved the door, taken a window – these are all the cookie-cutter, little Cape Cods there in that area. The new front porch will have a roof that comes up from the existing roof on the outhouse, excuse me, on the closet, that sticks out, and it will have stairs that go down to the side along the house, and railings, and a handrail, which will be a good thing, because the current stoop doesn't have a handrail. And I'll still have the closet. It's a wonderful thing, it's actually a very nice closet. It just leaves the house without an adequate front porch and without a covered front porch so there's always protection from weather, so this will have a lot of advantages, plus it will look better. There are several houses on the next street over that have that sideways porch design, so it will be very similar to that. And the house is now painted dark blue, that was done in the last few weeks. The porch will be with white trim to match the rest of the house. I think it'll be kind of pretty. And I plan to do window boxes, and flowers, I'm excited.

Chair McNary: It looks good. So that's one [project].

Ms. O'Neill: That's one, and the other is, the previous owner built a deck on the back that is 20 feet wide and about 8 feet deep, which is about far enough to take three steps and fall off the edge. It's not really even big enough for a table. And it has unprotected steps on three sides. I'm 72, I don't like unprotected steps very much, it's just too risky. What I'd like to do is have a deck that is about the same width, about 20 feet wide, but adds six feet, so it's 14 feet deep, and I'd like to put a covered sun porch on it with a shed roof, because it's south-facing. The house has already been converted to all electric, which means I have two baseboard heaters. I need to do some work on the HVAC systems, but I'd like to do solar panels eventually on that south-facing roof. The shed roof will give me just a little more roof space, and be consistent with the existing slope. I may build that in stages. I may do the deck, and the frame, and the roof, and then close it in, depending on cash flow and plans.

Chair McNary: Good, it sounds like an ambitious project, but I can appreciate a bigger porch.

Ms. O'Neill: I think it'll expand -- these houses aren't huge, without a lot of gathering space inside, so this will give a nice protected outdoor space, because we do have mosquitoes in Hyde Park, oddly.

Richard Perkins: Some of the variances are mainly because the zoning was put in place after the building was built.

Ms. O'Neill: I do understand that. As I was telling your wonderful staff, my very first job, when I was 23 years old, was explaining planning and zoning to the residents of Cole County, Missouri, around Jefferson City, back in 1974. I know a little about some of that zoning. I do understand zoning being put in place afterwards, and the houses are, just the way they are on the lot, doesn't work. So I'm seeking a variance to make beneficial additions to the house.

Chair McNary: Questions from the Board? *(There were none.)* Is there anybody from the public? I don't see any. Okay, this looks like an ambitious project, I commend you for that. We have not received any written comment? *(directed to the ZBA secretary)*

Kathleen Hoppe: We have not.

Chairman McNary made a motion to close the public hearing for O’Neill, and Richard Perkins seconded it. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

James Agrawal read the resolution to grant the area variances requested by the applicant. Richard Perkins seconded the motion. The resolution was granted by unanimous roll call vote.

Town of Hyde Park
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
4383 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park NY 12538
(845) 229-5111, ext. 2

RESOLUTION TO GRANT AREA VARIANCES

Margret A. O’Neill
24 Fuller Lane
Hyde Park, New York

Date: April 26, 2023

Motion: James Agrawal

Resolution # 23-05Z

Second: Richard Perkins

WHEREAS, the applicant, Margret A. O’Neill, has submitted an application for area variances to replace and expand a front porch and to expand and cover an existing rear deck (the “Project”) at property located at 24 Fuller Lane, Hyde Park, identified as tax parcel no. 6065-20-812006 in the Neighborhood and Historic Overlay Zoning Districts (the “Site”); and

WHEREAS, the Project is depicted on several sketches supplied by the applicant, dated October 30, 2022 and March 8, 2023 (the “Plan”); and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks an area variance from Zoning Law Section 108-5.15 to permit the construction and expansion of a front porch with a front yard setback on Fuller Lane of 44 feet where 50 feet is required; and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks an area variance from Zoning Law Section 108-5.15 to permit the construction and expansion of a front porch with a front yard setback on Garden Street of 38 feet where 50 feet is required; and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks an area variance from Zoning Law Section 108-5.15 to permit the expansion of an existing deck with a front yard setback on Garden Street of 29 feet where 50 feet is required (the “Requested Variances”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(17), the granting of an area variance for a single-family, two-family or three-family residence is a Type II action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act and is not subject to review under the Act; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was held on April 26, 2023 during a duly noticed meeting during which all those who wished to speak were heard; and

WHEREAS, the applicable standards for considering an area variance are set forth in Town Law Section 267-b and Hyde Park Zoning Law Section 108-33.6(B)(2), which require the Board to

take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the general neighborhood or community by such grant.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals makes the following findings in accordance with Section 267-b of the Town Law and Hyde Park Zoning Law Section 108-33.6(B)(2) regarding the Requested Variances:

1. The Requested Variances will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. This project will provide an attractive porch similar to other houses in the neighborhood and a covered back deck also similar to others in the neighborhood.
2. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than area variances. The position of the existing house and deck do not allow for the project to occur without these variances, as the lot is small and has a very small, limited area in which to do the work necessary.
3. The Requested Variances are numerically substantial. The front yard setbacks represent variances of 12%, 24%, and 42% from the 50 feet required (44 feet vs. 50 feet, 38 feet vs. 50 feet, and 29 feet vs. 50 feet).
4. The Requested Variances will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the general neighborhood or district. The Requested Variances will improve the character and appearance of the surrounding neighborhood.
5. The difficulties are self-created. The applicant purchased the house as-is.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby grants the Requested Variances subject to the following conditions:

1. Pursuant to Section 108-33.5(F)(1), the authorized activity must commence within one year from the date of issuance, otherwise it is revoked.
2. Payment of all fees and escrow.

Adopted:

ROLL CALL VOTE BY SECRETARY

James Agrawal	YES
Paul Donnelly	YES
Richard Perkins	YES
Vice Chair Bowen	YES
Chairman McNary	YES

MOTION CARRIED

Ms. O’Neill: We have a building permit [application] that Rich Pottenberg submitted with a check, I believe that’s in my file someplace. Can that go ahead and move forward now?

K. Moss: We need to do a site plan waiver because you're in an overlay district, so there's one more step.

Ms. O'Neill: What do I need to do, to do that?

K. Moss: Call me tomorrow.

Ms. O'Neill: Okay. Thank you.

MARCOZ & CHALK #23-04Z

Location: 16 Poppinga Lane, Hyde Park

Grid #: 6065-02-602972

Owners & Applicants: Nadia Marcoz and
Adrian Chalk

Representatives: Peter J. Andros, P.E. and Ralf
Mayer

Area Variance – Section 108-4.3G(2) in the Waterfront District

To allow construction within the Hudson River stream corridor, allowing demolition of the existing single-family home and replacing it with a new single-family home on substantially the same footprint.

Chairman McNary made a motion to open the public hearing for Marcoz & Chalk, and Vice Chair Bowen seconded it. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair McNary welcomed the applicant's representative, Peter Andros, P.E., to the applicant's table.

Chair McNary: You're looking for a variance to allow construction within the Hudson River stream corridor, allowing demolition of the existing house and replace it with a new single-family home on substantially the same footprint.

Mr. Andros: Correct. We can just transfer what you just said into the official record, because that's exactly what the proposal is – to replace the existing house with a new one. You're all pretty familiar with the site, or most of you are, anyway. And there isn't much room to do anything that's not within the 100-foot stream corridor, which is shown on – this is the variance plan, which is a little bit more simplified, because the 100-foot setback line is really the cogent part of the whole thing. I also sent a site plan – “existing conditions S1” – which showed the existing footprint of the house, and then “V”, which is the one that we have here, which shows the proposed footprint of the house. And this particular project and this house has been the subject of much back and forth between the Zoning Administrator and me and project architects and the Planning Board Chairman, and I think it's pretty self-explanatory as to what we're looking to do.

Chair McNary: This is a new variance, this is not a continuation of the old variance at all.

Mr. Andros: Correct.

Chair McNary: You're basically building in the stream corridor.

Mr. Andros: Yes. We're taking down in the stream corridor, and we're building in the stream corridor.

Chair McNary: A number of us visited because of the former variance on the pool.

Mr. Andros: Correct.

Chair McNary: We had a chance to look at the site a little bit. What do you see changing from where it is now?

Mr. Andros: It's basically the same footprint. It's on the same spot. The bird flies over, there's a footprint for the existing house, and there's a footprint for the new house. The footprint for the new house is essentially at the same spot as the old house. What we did do was add a couple of things on the north side which are outside of the existing footprint, but they meet the setback requirements for zoning. But we're here tonight for the stream corridor.

Chair McNary: The height of the house is going to change?

Mr. Andros: The height of the house, as measured by the Town of Hyde Park, will be slightly lower than the existing one.

Chair McNary: The existing one is about eight feet.

Mr. Andros: Oh, you mean the height above sea level.

Chair McNary: Yes.

Mr. Andros: Okay, I thought you meant the building height itself. The existing one is at about seven, a little over seven, and that's where the drive-through is. The new one is going to be at eleven [feet above sea level].

Chair McNary: So the first floor will be at eleven [feet above sea level].

Mr. Andros: Yes.

Chair McNary: This will be raised on what?

Mr. Andros: Concrete foundation with fill. We'll call it the ground floor, basically it's going to be a heated slab.

Richard Perkins: The stream corridor line that we have in that upper right-hand corner has a very odd line. Where is the actual stream?

Chair McNary: The river is the stream.

Richard Perkins: Oh, we're talking about the river? Oh, okay, we're pretty close. I got it.

Mr. Andros: Yes, it's the river. There isn't any stream there.

Chair McNary: How close are you to the stream at this point?

Mr. Andros: The original variance that was issued in 1980 was for a ten-foot setback from the river.

Chair McNary: Okay, and my guess is the river's changed.

Mr. Andros: Very good, because the deed – there are a number of deed descriptions for this parcel.

Chair McNary: But the original would have been with the new owner who has purchased this.

Mr. Andros: Right, but that one was totally unacceptable also, because if you looked at the original deed for this, out of Huyler, it said along the shoreline of the river, and you're correct – if the shoreline of the river changes, then the deed line changes. So this deed line, when it goes along the river, is the shoreline, which is a mean high water mark of the river now because we had it all re-surveyed. And we came to find out there were a couple of parts of the existing house that were over the line, if you will, that 10-foot setback line. So the proposed, or new replacement house footprint stays wholly within that original 10-foot setback.

Chair McNary: Okay, so you're looking for 10 feet from the river.

Mr. Andros: We already have that, we already have that variance from 1980.

Chair McNary: But that doesn't apply here.

Mr. Andros: No, we're just looking for stream corridor.

K. Moss: What happens, when the house comes down, the variance is lost. So it's a new variance.

Vice Chair Bowen: Which would be ten feet.

Mr. Agrawal: If it's the same footprint.

K. Moss: So, we're building in the stream corridor, which is what we're asking for, right?

Mr. Andros: Yes.

K. Moss: Okay. We're not asking for a variance for the little pieces that are extending out.

Mr. Andros: No, but what you just said really was a bit chilling to me at this particular point in the project development, because you said when the house comes down, the variance goes away.

K. Moss: So is the house coming down?

Mr. Andros: Yes.

K. Moss: Are the footings staying?

Mr. Andros: Probably some of them are.

K. Moss: The code for non-conforming structures – I went around when this was adopted, with the attorneys. Now we can talk to this attorney, but it appears as though once it comes down, you lose the – oh, because it's a variance – but I think you still lose the non-conforming status, because it's not non-conforming. So we'll have to talk about that.

Sarah Ryan: I'll have to take a look at that.

K. Moss: We'll have to look at that. I was not thinking of ones that didn't have a variance already. I was thinking of just a non-conforming structure that was coming down and being rebuilt. But this one had a variance, so this one's different, and we'll discuss it with the attorney.

Mr. Andros: Well, I guess that about wraps this up then.

Chair McNary: What I'd like to do, too, is again, ask the representatives from the Climate Committee of the Town to take a look at that too. I don't know if we'll need to get in touch with you. I'll have to ask if they want to see the site again or not.

Mr. Andros: Wasn't there somebody that was there?

Chair McNary: There was, but that was for the pool.

Mr. Andros: Yes, we had quite a conversation about the house, too, but that's okay.

K. Moss: The other thing I wanted to let the Board know is that there's a flood development permit that's required, and they are required to elevate that lowest opening. I think that's why there's such a great difference from the eight feet to the eleven feet. Is that right, Pete?

Mr. Andros: No, actually, since this whole thing with the 10-foot [setback], which is new to me tonight – no, actually, it should be elevated to 10 [feet].

K. Moss: But you're going to eleven [feet].

Mr. Andros: We're going to eleven [feet].

K. Moss: That's fine. But it does need to be elevated some, because it needs to be the BFE plus two, and then I think Westermeyer said plus another one, in the building code, but that may not have gone into effect yet.

Mr. Andros: Plus another one? Two plus one? Anyway, we're still okay.

K. Moss: You're still okay. I have to talk to him about that.

Chair McNary: This house was there for 43 years, roughly, 40 years.

Mr. Andros: Yes.

Chair McNary: So, in another 40 years, the river will be at least another 12 inches higher, or more.

Mr. Andros: That's true.

Chair McNary: In terms of this, which means probably the line will have changed by then, too.

Mr. Andros: Yes, who knows. Believe me, I won't be around for it.

Chair McNary: I think we've got more information to get here. It's a challenge, obviously engineering-wise. Thank you, sir.

Chairman McNary asked for a motion to continue the public hearing to May 24, 2023. Vice Chair Bowen made the motion and James Agrawal seconded it. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

NEW APPLICATION INTRODUCTION:

HOUGHTALING #23-02Z

Location: 7 Beck Road, Poughkeepsie
Grid #: 6263-01-115657

Owners & Applicants: Al Houghtaling and
Lisa Schoonmaker

Representative: Thomas P. Cummings, P.E.

Project Name: Al's Yard

Area Variances – Section 108-15.5 Bulk Regulations in the Greenbelt District

To change minimum side yard setback from 25 feet to 6 feet for an existing addition to a block garage and two steel storage containers, and change minimum side yard setback from 25 feet to 2 feet for an existing lean-to carport, at a licensed salvage yard and used car dealer location.

No one from this application was present, so no new application introduction for Houghtaling took place.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Approve minutes of February 22, 2023 ZBA meeting.

Chairman McNary asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2023 ZBA meeting. Vice Chair Bowen made the motion and James Agrawal seconded it. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

ADJOURN:

Chairman McNary asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Richard Perkins made the motion and James Agrawal seconded it. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting ended at approximately 6:38 PM.