

APPROVED

JOHN MAXWELL
Chairman

PHILIP AGLIETTI
Vice-Chairman

**TOWN OF CARMEL
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**



60 McAlpin Avenue
Mahopac, New York 10541
Tel. (845) 628-1500
www.ci.carmel.ny.us

MICHAEL CARNAZZA
*Director of Code
Enforcement*

BOARD MEMBERS

ROSE FABIANO
SILVIO BALZANO
WILLIAM ROSSITER
MARC DITOMASO
MICHAEL SCHWARZ

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES

FEBRUARY 23, 2017

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, JOHN MAXWELL,
SILVIO BALZANO, WILLIAM ROSSITER, MICHAEL SCHWARZ, MARC DITOMASO

ABSENT: VICE-CHAIRMAN, PHILIP AGLIETTI, ROSE FABIANO

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
NL & M Holding Corp (Mazzola)	75.44-1-47	1	Dismissed w/o Prejudice.
Ronald Topal	75.42-1-19	1	Heldover
Nancy B. Zweig	64.12-1-21	2	Granted
Michael Maguire	76.13-1-26	3-4	Granted
Richard & Sandra Luongo	75.6-1-32	4-8	Granted
Rosemary McGuire	76.17-1-3	8-9	Granted
Aydan Ibrahim	63.82-1-16	9-12	Granted

Minutes – December 22, 2016

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Andren

- **Application of NL & M HOLDING CORP (MAZZOLA) for a Variation of Section 156-15 and a Use Variance, seeking permission to complete second floor and add four apartments. The property is located at 936-942 South Lake Blvd, Mahopac NY 10541 and is known by Tax Map #75.44-1-47.**

Code Requires	Provided	Variance Required
Mixed use-Not Permitted	Retail & Apartments	Use Variance
Front yard north – 40 ft	35.57 ft	4.43 ft
Front yard south – 40 ft	23.4 ft	16.6 ft
Side yard west – 25 ft	0.7 ft	24.3 ft
Parking – 30 P.S.	5 P.S.	31 P.S.
Parking – 10 ft x 20 ft	9 ft x 20 ft	1 ft width
ADA Parking	0 P.S.	1 P.S.
Side yard east – 25 ft	0.2 ft	24.8 ft

Mr. Greenberg requested that it be held over again, one more time, according to his letter. Applicant is a CPA and this time of year difficult.

Chairman Maxwell responded, you're asking us to hold this over until May. At this point, it's been four or five times. It's taking up the burden of the tax payers and the time of the Board. I'll leave it up to the Board members and see what they think.

Mr. Greenberg added; that would obviously be the last postponement if you grant it.

Chairman Maxwell was concerned about setting a precedent and polled the Board members for their input. Mr. Schwarz stated he'd be glad to dismiss it without prejudice. Mr. Rossiter agreed; Mr. Balzano agreed and Mr. DiTomaso agreed.

Mr. Balzano moved to dismiss without prejudice; seconded by Mr. DiTomaso with all in favor.

- **Application of RONALD TOPAL for a Variation of Section 156-15, seeking permission to construct addition to existing house. The property is located at 751 South Lake Blvd. Mahopac, NY 10541 and is known by Tax Map #75.42-1-19.**

Code Requires	Provided	Variance Required
Front - 25 ft	10.80 ft	14.20 ft
Side - 10 ft	5.00 ft	5.0 ft
Rear north - 15 ft	0 ft	15.0 ft
Rear east – 15 ft	2 ft	13.0 ft

Chairman Maxwell stated that this was going to be postponed to next month due to an incorrect advertisement and indicated to the Public that the application would be heard next month due to the advertisement of a shed versus a house.

Mr. Balzano moved to postpone; seconded by Mr. DiTomaso with all in favor.

- **Application of NANCY B. ZWEIG for a Variation of Section 156-15, seeking permission to construct deck within front yard. The property is located at 18 Park Hill Terrace, Mahopac NY 10541 and is known by Tax Map #64.12-1-21.**

Code Requires	Provided	Variance Required
40 ft	23.07 ft	16.93 ft

John Power, architect for the Applicant, was sworn in.

Mr. Power stated the Applicant wishes to construct a 12 foot by 20.9 foot rear deck. We call it a rear deck because it's at the rear of the residence but because of the unusual shape of the lot, it's in the front yard setback.

Chairman Maxwell added; you're a corner lot so you're held to more restrict...

Mr. Power replied yes.

Mr. Carnazza interjected; it's more of a horseshoe going all the way around.

Mr. Balzano asked, so he has three fronts?

Mr. Power responded yes and added, as you can see, it's bow-tie shaped.

Chairman Maxwell asked if there was any other property that could be purchased to make it conform.

Mr. Power replied that if you look at the whole house, it's non-conforming. This is due to the zoning regulations being developed after the initial structure was built.

Chairman Maxwell stated yes. This was an old bungalow colony back in the day too.

Mr. Power added, as you can see if you wanted to build something complying, it would have to be in the shape of a triangle there and there's a dog leg shape, there's also a buildable area but it's separate from the house.

Chairman Maxwell asked if the deck would be off the kitchen.

Mr. Power responded yes.

Chairman Maxwell added that makes logical sense. It's not a very extreme variance and due to the nature of the lot configuration, I don't think it's too inconsiderate.

Chairman Maxwell polled the Board members for any questions to which there were none and then asked the public for any input.

Mr. Balzano moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Mr. DiTomaso with all in favor.

DECISION OF THE BOARD:

Mr. DiTomaso moved to approve the variance request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Balzano with all in favor.

- **Application of MICHAEL MAGUIRE for a Variation of Section 156-15, seeking permission to remove existing above-ground pool and install a bigger above-ground pool. The property is located at 168 Dahlia Drive, Mahopac NY 10541 and is known by Tax Map #76.13-1-26.**

Code Requires	Provided	Variance Required
20 ft - side	3 ft	17 ft

Mr. Michael Maguire was sworn in.

Mr. Maguire stated that he's looking to remove an existing above-ground pool and replace it with a larger above ground pool.

Chairman Maxwell stated, basically it's going on the same footprint as the one that's there now.

Mr. Maguire responded yes.

Chairman Maxwell furthered, you're not encroaching any further than the outboard or side lot line.

Mr. Maguire responded I'm probably going to come a little closer to my house.

Chairman Maxwell asked if there was any other property that could be purchased to make it conform.

Mr. Maguire responded no.

Mr. Carnazza interjected; I thought we were going to be a little bit closer to the property line. If I'm standing at your garage, looking at the pool, I thought it was going to be slightly more to the left. Isn't that what we determined?

Mr. Maguire responded no.

Mr. Balzano pointed out that the original variance is 8.1 from 1994 and this one now is 17.

Chairman Maxwell said that he met Mrs. Maguire out there yesterday and she said the deck that built into it, the blue portion, is going to be basically water.

Mr. Maguire responded, yes it's going to be water.

Chairman Maxwell asked if the neighbors on either side have any issue with it and if the Applicant had spoken with them.

Mr. Maguire responded no issues.

Chairman Maxwell then stated, I don't think it's going to be too encumbering because it's already existing. How long has it been there in that same location?

Mr. Maguire responded, my neighbor told me that the mid 1970s it was installed but they didn't get the variance until 1994.

Chairman Maxwell directed to Mr. Carnazza, the deck being attached is under different regulations.

Mr. Carnazza replied that's correct. You go by the principle setback.

Chairman Maxwell polled the Board members for input with no further questions.

Chairman Maxwell asked if there was any input or questions from the public on this application.

Mr. Rossiter moved to close the Public Hearing on this application; seconded by Mr. DiTomaso with all in favor.

DECISION OF THE BOARD:

Mr. Schwarz moved to grant the variance request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rossiter with all in favor.

- **Application of RICHARD & SANDRA LUONGO for a Variation of Section 156-15, seeking permission to retain existing shed on property. The property is located at 9 Hamlin Road, Mahopac, NY 10541 and is known by Tax Map #75.6-1-32.**

Code Requires	Provided	Variance Required
15 ft	2 ft	13 ft

Mrs. Sandra Luongo was sworn in.

Mrs. Luongo stated she was looking to get a 13 ft variance on a shed that's already existing.

Chairman Maxwell stated he was out there and it's built on a slab. How long has it been there for?

Mrs. Luongo replied six years.

Chairman Maxwell asked; you didn't know you needed a variance or a building permit?

Mrs. Luongo replied no. I had no idea.

Chairman Maxwell asked if they bought it from a company.

Mrs. Luongo replied Sears.

Chairman Maxwell stated, there was nothing there prior to; it's been there for six years. We did receive a letter of opposition. I'll read it for the benefit of the Board members who did not get a chance to read it and for the public. *"I'm writing to object to the variance allowing the shed on the Applicant's property to remain in such close proximity to the property line. Zoning preserves property values and makes cities and towns better places to live and I believe that my property value would be adversely affected. Especially when the time arises for me to retire and sell my property. There are numerous other areas on the Applicant's property where the shed could be moved. Violating the code was never necessary in this situation and allowing a variance just encourages such violations. Unfortunately, the homeowner tends to put things behind the shed in an attempt to keep things tidy which, thereby, has those items leaning up against my fence causing damage in the past. In fact today, there's something leaning up against my newly replaced fence. Please understand I am not a complaining neighbor. In fact, I have been overly tolerant. Although I was shocked to see how close the shed to my property line many years ago, I never said a word about it. This homeowner has placed a huge batting cage within view of my property without discussing same with me. Upon going to their home to discuss a different issue, I was cursed at by Mrs. Luongo and had her slam her door in my face so you can see why I would be hesitant to approach them about anything at this point. I'm actually unable to attend tonight's meeting due to a work obligation and would ask that you take*

my objection into consideration. I've lived in my home for 25 years; have raised two children in Mahopac, one of which is a member of Mahopac Falls Volunteer Fire Department and Ambulance Corps. Respectfully, Louisa Eaton." Usually when we get a letter like that, there's obviously some opposition to what you've done and not going through the proper channels so we have to take that into consideration. Do you have the ability to move this shed?

Mrs. Luongo replied I wouldn't have actually put it there if I could've put it in a different place. We have so many leads all over from the septic tank and just the way the property is situated, I don't know where else I could put it. If I put it in the back, that's not really my property either and then it's all wet back there because of the woods and there's rodents so I don't know where else I could actually put it to be quite honest.

Chairman Maxwell asked; there are wetlands in the back?

Mrs. Luongo replied, well we have the woods from all around Red Mills so it's not considered my property but it's so moist and stuff. Ideally I'd like to put it there so you couldn't see it at all but it's not practical to go there.

Chairman Maxwell asked, could you possibly move it inboard, away from the neighbor's fence a couple of feet so that it's less of a variance that is required?

Mrs. Luongo stated; it would look kind of awkward. I guess that's the reason why we put it where it is and it's on a slab so I guess at that point, I'd probably just take it down I guess. I don't know. To be quite honest, it's really not about the shed with her. It's about the batting cage. It's been there for six years. She's really angry about the batting cage. She never had a problem with the shed all these years because if she did, she would've said something years ago.

Chairman Maxwell asked, in an effort to be neighborly, could you guys move the batting cage away from her property line. I was out there yesterday and it looks like there's room to move it away from her property.

Mrs. Luongo replied; it's a big endeavor. It took forever to put it in. We actually hired people to put it in.

Chairman Maxwell said, in the spirit of being neighborly and to put a condition on this if the Board so deems, I think fair and being neighborly to someone who is complaining about something that was done illegally, basically by putting the shed there without getting the proper paperwork for it and filing it.

Chairman Maxwell then polled the Board for input.

Mr. Schwarz asked, you don't need a permit for the batting cage do you?

Mr. Carnazza replied no.

Mr. Schwarz then stated, I don't think you can really force the Applicant to move the batting cage. I think there's a problem with you storing things behind the shed but maybe you would agree to not use the rear of the shed for storage purposes.

Mrs. Luongo replied absolutely.

Chairman Maxwell stated he was there yesterday and didn't see anything.

Mrs. Luongo replied there's really nothing. Like I said, it's not about the shed for her. It's about the batting cage. She's angry about that.

Mr. DiTomaso stated, I would just definitely condition, if we entertain the variance, nothing can be put up against the neighbors fence any longer because they'll be looking.

Mrs. Luongo replied, absolutely. I don't even know what I actually put behind it because it's really not a large area but I won't put anything behind it. I have no problem with that, I'll put nothing.

Chairman Maxwell asked; her fence is most likely on the property line, right?

Mr. Balzano said survey doesn't show it and added, I'm concerned a little bit and would like to see it moved in a little bit as well.

Mr. DiTomaso asked, if it's on a concrete slab, is there any room on the slab, after the shed – more toward your house?

Mrs. Luongo replied, to move it? I guess we would probably have to break it. My friend commented that you can't move it because of the slab.

Chairman Maxwell stated, that you could just pour more concrete or even gravel.

Mr. Rossiter pointed out possible interference with the batting cage.

Chairman Maxwell then asked if we wanted to move it forward, what's a fair number.

Mr. DiTomaso replied, I'd say three feet?

Mr. Balzano added; that would get you to ten.

Mr. Rossiter then said ten feet off the line.

Chairman Maxwell said, yes, ten feet and then said, in the spirit of being neighborly and helping out a little bit, would you be averse to doing that?

Mrs. Luongo replied; no that's fine.

Chairman Maxwell then asked the public for any input on the Application.

Gerald McCarthy was sworn in.

Mr. McCarthy stated that I live across the street and it doesn't look unnatural. I know you have your regulations and you have to do what you have to do but you were out there and you said you saw it, right? It looks like it's off the property line. I know you have regulations but it's certainly not abutted on top of her fence or property line. They keep their place meticulous.

Chairman Maxwell interjected, its close but typically when you have a shed on a property line, it's either screened by some kind of trees which would be another option to make it look more natural and such.

Mr. McCarthy then stated; this is about the batting cage. I know that firsthand.

Chairman Maxwell replied; I'm sure it is but unfortunately she couldn't be here to speak her mind it sounded like from her letter. We have to be fair.

Mr. McCarthy interjected, I get it. I just wanted to say that they always keep the property orderly. It's not haphazard or anything.

Chairman Maxwell replied; the property looks very well maintained. I could appreciate that. So; that might be another option when we decide on this case – to put some screening there. Six to eight foot arborvitae pine trees of some sort to help screen it a little bit. Probably on each corner – I don't know.

Mrs. Luongo replied, it's really odd because when you look at that fence she can only see the top part (the shed) – maybe a foot. Truthfully, it's not about the shed with her. You can't see through the fence at all. It's a wood fence.

Chairman Maxwell said, okay; we'll think about what's best.

Mr. Balzano moved to close the Public Hearing on this application; seconded by Mr. Schwarz with all in favor.

DECISION OF THE BOARD:

Mr. Balzano moved to grant for discussion purposes. The motion was seconded by Mr. DiTomaso.

Chairman Maxwell opened for discussion and asked for comments and concerns.

Mr. Balzano asked; what do we do here. Do we move it, do we put trees up?

Chairman Maxwell replied; in retrospect, I don't think trees are going to work. You only have a two foot strip to the fence.

Mr. Balzano agreed and added to Mrs. Luongo's point, you only see the top of the shed anyway. It's more about the property line and I understand the other stuff that's going on too. The shed is there illegally so that means it's a self-created issue that starts the game.

Chairman Maxwell then added, what's the value of bringing it forward? It gets it off the fence, gets the neighbor a little more content that it's not as close to their fence and as close to their property line. What's the value of pouring a 3 foot by 10 foot slab or bed of gravel?

There was further discussion about the costs involved.

Mr. Carnazza pointed out that if you pull it away from the fence, the neighbor is actually going to see it more.

There was further discussion about pulling the shed away from the fence.

Mr. Folchetti stated; I wouldn't condition it on anything that relates to a temporary facility or structure that is otherwise permitted because the controls lack one way or the other. If there is no place that they're required to locate the batting cage on the property, there's no way to effectively enforce whatever condition you're imposing.

Mr. Carnazza added; it's equal to a children's play area and we don't have any set-backs for swing sets, slides, anything of the sort.

Chairman Maxwell said, alright so do we condition increasing or; they don't even have to pour a slab. They could pull the shed forward and put pressure treated down.

Mr. Schwarz said; at the end of the day.....the Applicant is coming here for relief from this Board. The complaint that you have from the neighbor cites property value but there's no proof this is going to damage her property value. The expense of moving it forward and it may be more visible to the

neighbors.... I don't see really what the harm is in leaving the shed where it is today. We've granted variances where much closer to the property line in other instances too. I'm of the opinion we should grant the variance as requested.

Mr. DiTomaso stated; I agree with Mr. Schwarz but to make it a condition that absolutely nothing can be stored behind the shed or up against the neighbors fence.

Mr. Balzano directed to Mr. Folchetti; "can we do that?"

Mr. Folchetti replied; like equipment or whatever? I don't know how you condition that. It's temporary and interpretive as well.

Mr. Carnazza added; they shouldn't be leaning anything on the fence if it's not their fence but that's not an enforcement issue with the Town of Carmel Building Department. It's not zoning code.

Chairman Maxwell agreed that issue is out of their purview.

A roll call vote was taken as follows:

- Mr. Schwarz: For the motion
- Mr. Rossiter: For the motion
- Mr. DiTomaso: For the motion
- Mr. Balzano: For the motion
- Chairman Maxwell: For the motion

- **Application of ROSEMARY McGUIRE for a Variation of Section 156-15, seeking permission to construct garage and addition to existing house. The property is located at 25 Teakettle Spout Road, Mahopac, NY 10541 and is known by Tax Map #76.17-1-3.**

Code Requires	Provided	Variance Required
25 ft	15 ft	10 ft

Rosemary McGuire was sworn in.

Mrs. McGuire stated they are looking to put up a detached garage. We're also doing a renovation to our home to the existing footprint but we wanted to add the garage because we currently do not have one.

Mr. Carnazza interjected, only the garage needs a variance. The addition does not.

Chairman Maxwell noted that they were doing it on the right side and that's obviously the most logical place for it.

Mrs. McGuire agreed and said; it just makes sense that you drive right into it.

Chairman Maxwell said; I was out there yesterday also. There's nothing nearby in the back; the nearest house, to the right, was in a common driveway. It doesn't affect your septic or anything?

Mrs. McGuire responded no. That's why we have it where we have it on the plans because our septic is in the backyard and our well is in the front yard.

Chairman Maxwell said, alright that makes sense. You're connecting it with a breezeway, correct?

Mrs. McGuire replied yes.

Chairman Maxwell noted that it's not a major variance, have plenty of property around and then asked, if there was any other property that could be bought to bring it into conformance?

Mrs. McGuire replied no.

Chairman Maxwell also noted that they have a tight lot – width wise – but it goes deeper. Is that common driveway an easement?

Mrs. McGuire replied yes; there's an easement there.

Chairman Maxwell asked for Board members input with no further questions and then asked the public for any input on the application.

Mr. DiTomaso moved to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Rossiter with all in favor.

DECISION OF THE BOARD:

Mr. Balzano moved to grant the variance request. The motion was seconded by Mr. DiTomaso with all in favor.

- Application of **AYDAN IBRAHIM** for a Variation of Section 156-15, seeking permission to remove existing 1 story house and build new house on property. The property is located at 209 North Road, Mahopac, NY 10541 and is known by Tax Map #63.82-1-16.

Code Requires	Provided	Variance Required
10 ft – side setback/hous	5.1 ft	4.9 ft (east side)
10 ft – side setback/deck	6.2 ft	3.8 ft (east side)
10 ft – side setback/porch	6.2 ft	3.8 ft (east side)
10 ft – side setback/hous	9.9 ft	0.1 ft (west side)

Steven Secon, Architect, working with the owners was sworn in.

Mr. Secon stated, what we're proposing to do is remove an existing house that has run into some disrepair. It's a one-story kind of bungalow and put in a two-story, non-conforming house of about 1700 square feet. Due to the narrowness and non-conformity of the lot, we're before you tonight seeking approximately a five foot variance on the east side – that relates to a house, deck and porch. The porch is there to soften up the front of the house; give it a little more curb appeal. The deck in the rear is a fairly modest deck that's just for the family to use in the backyard.

Chairman Maxwell interjected, alright so you're going on the same footprint; same foundation basically?

Mr. Secon replied not exactly but very close.

Mr. Balzano asked how far you are coming.

Mr. Secon replied we're coming 5' off the property line.

Mr. Balzano asked so how many feet.....

Mr. Secon replied; it's approximately the same as what's there now but it's one story and going higher.

Mr. Balzano stated; Oh it is the same. That's what Chairman Maxwell's question was; you're staying within the same footprint of the house; you're just going up.

Mr. Carnazza interjected, no. They're shifting the whole house to give a driveway on one side if I remember correctly.

Mr. Secon replied right. There's currently a driveway and the east side foundation, basically, is still in the same place but it's a wider house.

Mr. Carnazza said; I thought you were shifting it over so you could drive past it.

Mr. Secon replied no.

Chairman Maxwell stated the driveway is on the left of the house, you're shifting away from that side.

Mr. Secon replied correct and slightly. We're widening the house because it's basically like a shotgun shack style where you walk in room through room. What we're proposing to do is have the minimum width to get two rooms adjoining.

Chairman Maxwell asked, so the greatest variance is the 4.9 foot one and that's on the back part of...

Mr. Secon interjected, that's on the house itself.

Chairman Maxwell replied yes, but the back right corner; because there's two different numbers.

Mr. Secon interjected yes; the back right corner is the biggest encroachment.

Chairman Maxwell asked; have you spoken with the neighbors on the right hand side? (then added) or on both sides?

Mr. Secon replied I don't know.

Aydan Ibrahim was then sworn in.

Mr. Ibrahim stated that during the early stages the neighbors noticed they were going in and out of the house and we put a fence around to prevent people from going in. The neighbors on the right side, which is the east side of the property, asked us what we're doing there. We told them that we're going to knock the existing structure down and build a new house on top of it – two floors single family on the property. They looked favorable to us. They didn't come back and say anything to us. The neighbor on the left side, when I went there a few times to shovel snow, seemed very nice and favorable people.

Chairman Maxwell interjected; so you don't currently reside there?

Mr. Ibrahim replied no.

Chairman Maxwell then asked; do you plan to occupy or is this an investment home?

Mr. Ibrahim replied this is an investment. We are going to build it and sell it to a new homeowner.

Chairman Maxwell asked if there was any other property to purchase to bring it into conformance.

Mr. Ibrahim replied no.

Chairman Maxwell then acknowledged; you're land locked there as well. He then stated there are no septic issues as this is all sewer.

Mr. Ibrahim agreed, "town water and sewer".

Chairman Maxwell then stated; it's just the nature of this neighborhood as well but because you're going up on a second story, it's a little more stringent.

Mr. Secon interjected; if I could offer, we have some satellite images of area houses and that the fabric of the neighborhood has many two story houses.

Chairman Maxwell interjected; do you have them with you?

Mr. Carnazza asked, if I come off Copland, which house is it?

Mr. Ibrahim replied; the one on the right side – the east side. Once you come around the bend, I would be the third house on the left. He then referred to a picture stating, "the one that we have over there really stands out".

Mr. Carnazza reviewed a satellite application on laptop & clarified that if you come in off of Lake Shore, it would be the third house on the left – not Copland.

Chairman Maxwell asked; what distance past the existing foundation are you going? Two more feet to the right than what's there now?

Mr. Secon replied; if you refer to the site plan, you can actually see the old dotted foundation which, on the east side, coincides with what's there. We're not going to use the foundation because we're putting a two story house on something that's.....

Chairman Maxwell interjected; you're going to do poured concrete – it looks like it's block now.

Mr. Secon replied correct. The actual footprint of the proposed house is going to be different – deeper and a little bit wider on the west side.

Mr. Carnazza stated, the house on the right of you is already two stories and the one on the left is one and three quarters.

Mr. Secon replied correct.

Chairman Maxwell added, so it's not out of character.

Mr. Secon replied correct.

Mr. Carnazza asked; is this the house that had water in the basement? Do you know? The fire department had to come and pump it out.

Mr. Ibrahim replied no water.

Chairman Maxwell said; there's a garage existing in the back. That's going away?

Mr. Secon replied yes.

Chairman Maxwell then asked; there's no plan for a garage coming in?

Mr. Ibrahim replied no.

Inaudible discussion between Board and Mr. Secon while looking at the images.

Chairman Maxwell then stated; judging by the picture, I'm sure anything that you do is going to be an improvement and the neighbors would welcome it as it could increase the value of their homes. So we'll take that into consideration.

Chairman Maxwell then opened it up to the Board and then asked the public for any input on this application.

Mr. Schwarz moved to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. DiTomaso with all in favor.

DECISION OF THE BOARD:

Mr. DiTomaso moved to grant the variance request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Balzano with all in favor.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Minutes – 12/22/16

Mr. Balzano moved to accept minutes; the motion was seconded by Mr. Schwarz with all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Andren