

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

August 2, 2016

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Zoning Board of Appeals is called to order by Kevin Veitch at 7:30 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Kevin Veitch, Denise Eskoff, Curt Kolakowski, Laura Sanda, Joseph Szpak, and Andrew Wine, Alternate.

July 5, 2016 MINUTES

MOTION: D. Eskoff

SECOND: C. Kolakowski

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of July 5, 2016, with the following change:

C. Cartier – Resolution, Criteria – remove **“It is not a substantial request”**

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski

Noes: None

Abstain: Sanda, Szpak

NEW BUSINESS

GALARNEAU BUILDERS – Area Variance

Case # 966, Copperfield Road

Dave Barrass is present for the applicant. K. Veitch explains that the applicant is seeking an area variance to build a garage apartment. D. Eskoff questions that the application states that this parcel was previously before the ZBA at the time that the property was subdivided. R. Rowland will look into this. J. Szpak states that it appears that the wetlands are what is driving the location of the structure. D. Barrass states that it is; that the property drops off to the east of the driveway and would require fill in that area. L. Sanda questions the length of the driveway in front of the garage as the structure may be able to be moved a few feet. The standard parking space length is 20'. J. Szpak asks what is in the wetlands. D. Barrass states lower level wetland vegetation, some trees, etc. L. Sanda asks if there is a garage on the existing home. D. Barrass states that he does not believe there is. A. Wine questions the septic system. R. Rowland explains that a garage apartment must have a separate septic system. The Board requests some photos of the surrounding area and the length of the parking area in front of the garage.

RESOLUTION – Galarneau Builders, Area Variance

MOTION: J. Szpak

SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals accepts the application of Galarneau Builders for area variances for a garage apartment for property located at 16 Copperfield Road, TM#152.-1-9.11 and sets a public hearing for September 6, 2016 at 7:30 p.m., contingent upon:

- **Receipt of photos of the surrounding area**
- **Receipt of dimension of parking area in front of garage**

August 2, 2016

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak
Noes: None

ROBERT FRASER – Area Variance

Case # 967, Locust Grove Road

Robert Fraser is present and reviews that he is seeking an area variance to construct a 610 square foot living room addition to his home which was built in 1860. Any new construction to the front of the house would require relief from the current setbacks. D. Eskoff asks if the applicant has investigated alternatives. R. Fraser states that this is where the current living room is located and they do not want to demo the new porch that was constructed during the renovations. This would be in keeping with the same character of the existing home. D. Eskoff asks if the Board can be provided with some photographs of the surroundings. J. Szpak questions what is across the street. R. Fraser explains and states that those homes would also require setback variances should they wish to construct. R. Fraser will provide elevations, the room layout, etc.

RESOLUTION – R. Fraser, Area Variance

MOTION: J. Szpak

SECOND: K. Veitch

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals accepts the application of Robert Fraser for an area variance for an addition for property located at 266 Locust Grove Road, TM#1151.-3-11.1 and sets a public hearing for September 6, 2016 at 7:30 p.m., contingent upon:

- **Receipt of photos of the surrounding area**

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak
Noes: None

OLD BUSINESS

TAMMEY & SCOTT HERITAGE – Temporary Use Variance & Area Variance

Case #964 and Case #965, Tannery Hill Road

Tammey and Scott Heritage are present. A public hearing is opened at 7:50 p.m. There being no public comments, this public hearing is closed.

K. Veitch reviews that the applicants are seeking a temporary use variance to live in their existing mobile home until they receive a certificate of occupancy for their new modular home. Temporary use variances are issued for a specific timeframe after the receipt of the certificate of occupancy, at which time the current mobile home would have to be removed. K. Veitch explains that we have done this often in the past. J. Szpak reviews the criteria and states that he has no problem with the variance. Discussion takes place regarding the timeframe to remove the mobile home. Consensus is that 60 days is reasonable and then the applicant can request an extension if necessary. C. Kolakowski questions if the applicant will be using the existing well and septic system. K. Veitch states that is really a question for the Building Department to work out. J. Szpak asks if the applicants have considered placing the new home facing the side property line. T. Heritage states that she has lived for 28 years with her home facing the side and would like it to face the road. D. Eskoff states that it would look nicer facing the road. J. Szpak questions the buffers and states that it would be an improvement.

August 2, 2016

RESOLUTION – T. & S. Heritage, Area Variance

MOTION: J. Szpak

SECOND: K. Veitch

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals approves the application of Tammey and Scott Heritage for area variances for the construction of a new home for property located at 45 Tannery Hill Road, TM#98.-2-37.2, as follows:

- **Left side yard setback variance of 23'**
- **Right side yard setback variance of 23'**

This approval is based on the following criteria:

- **The request will not have any adverse physical or environmental effects**
- **Benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. This will be an upgrade to the neighborhood as this will be a new structure. This is a pre-existing non-conforming lot.**
- **Difficulty is not self-created**

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak

Noes: None

RESOLUTION – T. & S. Heritage, Temporary Use Variance

MOTION: J. Szpak

SECOND: K. Veitch

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals approves the application of Tammey and Scott Heritage for a temporary use variance to live in their existing mobile home during the construction of a new home for property located at 45 Tannery Hill Road, TM#98.-2-37.2, contingent upon:

- **Mobile home to be removed 60 days after receipt of Certificate of Occupancy**

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak

Noes: None

TOM ROOHAN, 519 Broadway LLC – Use Variance/Area Variance

Case#962, Maple Avenue

Tom Roohan and David Carr, The LA Group, are present. K. Veitch states that the new document was received which was the applicant's comparison between existing and proposed uses, and the purpose of this was to provide information on reasonable return and the possibility of a hardship. D. Eskoff states that reasonable return is one of the factors of hardship. The applicant provided more information basically discounting as not applicable almost everything that is in the district and then there is a paragraph on the end regarding office, personal service, studio, retail and mixed use. J. Szpak states that per the document, if it were to be maintained as the existing apartment, the net operating income is stated as \$2,565 and the argument is that that is not a reasonable return. D. Eskoff states that the applicant is stating that that is not the best reasonable return they can get for the use, that the storage units would provide them with more. J. Szpak states that definitely the storage units will provide more income, but that is not what we are evaluating. We are evaluating if it maintains its use, that there is a reasonable return. D. Eskoff states that they are saying that the current property is below the 8% that is being used as a baseline. D. Carr states that is from Saratoga County. D. Eskoff states that they are using an 8% reasonable return with the house now as it stands. J. Szpak states that then that is the argument, this is the estimated rate of return and that is not reasonable when compared to what is the standard for this area for a reasonable rate of return. A. Wine

August 2, 2016

states that \$2,500 is the anticipated income for the first year assuming the ZBA did not give approval and the building was kept as is with the required repairs. D. Eskoff states that the other option would be to tear it down, in which case, they are saying to replace it because of the location of the septic, well, utilities, etc., the lot is only 50' wide, that it can be done, but it would not provide a reasonable return on what was put there. The other option was from the Planning Board's comments discussing an office because the property next door is a dental office and they wanted to see something more like that, but to D. Eskoff you would have to retrofit that also and might possibly not even be able to do it. T. Roohan states that it was a garage with a small apartment above it and at some time they took out the garage door and put living space downstairs; it is pretty rough. A. Wine states that it does not look good from the outside. K. Veitch states that the required work is \$7,400. If they were to try to create something else there, it would be well beyond \$7,400 to retro fit it. D. Eskoff states that it would be very small and the chances of renting it for \$10,000 would be very difficult. D. Carr states that the footprint of the existing structure is less than 400 square feet. D. Eskoff states that her biggest concern with this part of it is what they have been saying about the fact that even if they tore it down, to put something in there it would be very difficult to put in everything that would have to go along with it. Which she states that she thinks does make it unique and more unique because what was said about the width, etc., you can still get an area variance. No matter what they put there you would have to get a variance. She does not see that part of it being as unique as the fact that they are very limited in what they can do in that 50' in that location. D. Carr states that he agrees that you could get an area variance, but the point he was trying to make is that an area variance would be so large and then you have to put the septic system in, you don't need a well because there is water there and a lot of these uses would require a larger than normal septic system to begin with. The uses to the applicant, that even made any sense, were the 4 uses at the end, however, even those uses, with this size, become incredibly difficult. D. Eskoff states that there is always something that you could put there that would be useable, but if you are looking at the septic, in a low lying area – that is what she is trying to find, that uniqueness for this particular piece of property. A. Wine states that they could absolutely tear this down and build another single family dwelling there, and he asks if they would estimate those numbers to be similar to what is on the first page for the existing apartment. It could be lower because they would be investing in an entirely new structure. J. Szpak states that they don't have that now so that is what he is a little bit worried about. He is not suggesting that this is a good idea, but he is thinking, when weighing this against the criteria, if they tore the house down and put another single family house in its place, went through all the gyrations and manipulations that you would have to do to make such a thing happen – say that cost \$350,000, now you have a single family home that is not in a desirable location and you are going to rent it out. It would rent out for more than \$600. D. Eskoff states that her guess is that they wouldn't rent it at that point but sell it. D. Carr states that in the way they looked at this, as he is a land planner, someone is going to have to want to buy it. He looks at it as, who wants to live there? It is not a residential area. J. Szpak states that the problem he is having is that he has to have evidence of that, so if a realtor told him that that is not marketable to sell a new home in that space. T. Roohan states that he would not want to typically spend more than 25% of the value of the lot. If the lot is \$115,000 and spend 3 times that on the construction, let's just say \$300,000 – he would not want to have a \$400,000 single family home for sale right here. J. Szpak questions that we need that documented. C. Kolakowski states that the way he would look at that, with his background, it would be the same as saying why don't we have evidence that you can't do a funeral home or cemetery, because it is so impractical in that location with the size. J. Szpak states that then C. Kolakowski is saying that that is not a reasonable request for an evaluation because of the unique situation of this lot. C. Kolakowski states that he does not need to see a financial analysis done of a cemetery, of a child care center or some of these other things because he knows they are not practical at that location. In his mind he puts a house and everything that goes along with it as not a practical situation. D. Eskoff states that some towns would make you do that. A. Wine states that he is curious, why are we even covering all this stuff when it is probably self-created. He is still having a hard time working around that. D. Eskoff states that the Board has to go through each of the 5 factors. D. Carr asks why A. Wine is assuming that it is self-created. A. Wine states that when the applicant bought the property, what were his plans? T. Roohan states that this only came to light when the insurance company did an inspection and said, you have to do these things. He got an estimate from a contractor who said it would be \$7400. He was thinking he might as well burn the money because this property is not very good. They

August 2, 2016

were forced to buy it in order to get Dr. Flemming's office, the strip mall and the credit union. D. Carr states that is his argument against the self-created because T. Roohan didn't buy just this property. A. Wine states that he didn't know that. D. Carr states that the first thing they did was to talk to G. McKenna and say that they thought it made sense to combine all these lots. The lot where the dentist office is is substandard, too. G. McKenna told them that he thought they would create more problems. D. Carr states that he does not know how they got to the credit union and the other building on the same lot in the first place, and that wasn't them. He reiterates that this lot was not purchased on its own, it was part of a larger purchase. J. Szpak states that he does not understand the advice because to him the best overall thing would be to make it part of the other lot and there might not be anything there other than a few pine trees and a picnic table. He is struggling with the self-created thing. D. Eskoff states that the self-created is a huge part of this case, but it is the last item and the self-created for a use variance basically discusses whether one is aware of the zoning when they purchased the property and if they weren't they should have been. K. Veitch asks if you buy a property with the intent to rent an apartment, then the insurance company comes along and says it is not habitable and they are not going to insure it, the owner just bought it that way. Is it self-created? A. Wine states that maybe they should have had it inspected before the purchase. K. Veitch states that we are talking about insurance company's criteria vs. what a regular inspector might see. The insurance company looks at it from a loss standpoint. A building inspector might look at it just to make sure that certain components are functioning. D. Eskoff states that being in the business, she is sure that the applicant took some look at it. T. Roohan states that the criteria that insurance companies inflict on you changes every year. He indicates that he has a building on Phila Street which has been inspected every year and this year they don't like the way the electrical service is. 4 years ago they changed it because the insurance company didn't like the way it was then, now they don't like the way it is now. They don't like where the deep fryers are - they have been there for more than 10 years. The criteria that the companies require you to meet because of their loss experience changes all the time. When they bought this they didn't think anything of it. The tenant wanted to stay, they thought it was fine. D. Eskoff reads a summation of NYS Law on this – *The cases hold that a party who knowingly acquires land for a use prohibited by the Zoning ordinance creates his own hardship, even if he did not actually learn of the prohibition at the time of the purchase he is nevertheless chargeable with knowing the restrictions on use.* The use in this case is self-storage units. This is the way NYS Law looks at it. K. Veitch states that that sounds like you bought it to put a storage unit on it. C. Kolakowski states that he obtained a use variance in the City of Saratoga Springs, he was a contract purchaser on the property and he had to go through this process himself. Under that criteria, at the time you would know what the use of that property is and your offer is contingent. In his mind, they did not do that here; they intended to keep that tenant there in that property. D. Eskoff asks if C. Kolakowski's case was before or after the property was purchased. If the applicant had come to the ZBA before the property was purchased, this would not even be on the table. C. Kolakowski states that is correct, they would be purchasing it for that use and that's too bad, you should have known. This is after, after it was already an existing use and he feels satisfied with it in respect to the inspections, etc., because he has had the same experience himself. There is usually a structural inspection; there is a code inspection; and there is an insurance inspection that you can do – and he has had the same experience where he has had the same thing for years and all of a sudden they come and say by the way, we don't like those stairs anymore, you have to rip them out and change them, and if you don't you are not going to be insured. K. Veitch states that you also cannot switch insurance companies because once it is red flagged by one, they all know. A. Wine questions that the applicant's original intent when he purchased the property was for the tenant there to remain there. T. Roohan states exactly. D. Eskoff asks if the applicant wanted to combine the properties and it was suggested that he didn't. Was that the original plan? T. Roohan states that they really didn't give that any thought. D. Eskoff states that then he didn't have any broader range of ideas – just go with what was there at this time. R. Rowland states that because they are substandard lots now, if the applicant joins them together, he can't subdivide them again without area variances. T. Roohan states that their vision, and Jim Dorsey built this, they liked the way it was and their vision was to just keep operating it. D. Eskoff states that that goes to the intent and knowledge, and that is what she is trying to establish by asking that question. T. Roohan states that they had no vision to make any changes. D. Eskoff states that that is really the overriding factor in this case because it was purchased and then they came to us. A. Wine asks how long

August 2, 2016

after the purchase did the insurance company do an inspection. T. Roohan states almost 5 months. A. Wine asks how long after that did he come to the ZBA. T. Roohan states 2 or 3 months. He went to see G. McKenna first because he was horrified at getting an estimate for \$7400. T. Roohan states that your experience tells you that it can get into more; it is not like paving a driveway. They spoke to Mr. Stevens next door whose property line runs all the way and he was very supportive of this idea. L. Sanda questions if everyone surrounding this property is on public water. Discussion takes place about where the water is. L. Sanda questions that the existing apartment has a septic system in place and where that is located. D. Carr states that it is one line and very close to the property line, and he is sure that it is probably not in great shape. D. Eskoff asks how old the structure is. T. Roohan states probably 50 years. L. Sanda states that if the applicant built a new apartment or home, the system would need to be large, it would include a tank and then the neighbors' have wells and what are those limits. K. Veitch states that he can buy that the hardship is not self-created. D. Eskoff states not due to personal problems but due to the situation. K. Veitch states that the reasonable return has been pretty much proven. The uniqueness is that it is not a substantial part of the district or the neighborhood. D. Eskoff states that she thinks that it can be buffered from the street with some conifers, tall arborvitaes. She does not know what the Planning Board will do with lighting, they may still want the applicant to put in some for safety. If the ZBA grants this, it would be a use variance and not an allowed use in our zoning even though right up the road in Wilton there are plenty, it could be buffered nicely so that you really couldn't tell what was back there, it would blend back to the shopping center, etc. She thinks that visually it could work; it is such a narrow lot. T. Roohan states that was their goal in taking out the driveway so that there would be a nice long landscaping. D. Eskoff states that she does not know if the Planning Board, and has the applicant thought about this, is going to want them to do 14 units. Any variance granted would not be for a definite 14 units. K. Veitch states that if he were on the Planning Board, the portion that faces out to Maple Avenue, his feeling would be, why can't you design that end unit to look like a peak roofed structure. D. Carr states that it is proposed to be. D. Eskoff states that what she gathered from their comments, they were more concerned with the fact that they were looking to bring in another small business such as the dentist office. To bring that building up to standards for a professional office would not be practical in the reasonable return department from what she is seeing from the numbers. K. Veitch states that if they were to alter that building into some type of office use, he does not believe that they could meet the handicap requirements, the ramps, restroom facilities, etc. A. Wine asks if they are planning to cut down any of the trees. D. Carr states that he does not believe so on the Maple Avenue side. D. Eskoff states that they already have an access point from the side of the lot. She wants to make sure that the ZBA has covered everything that could potentially be an environmental impact or essential character of the neighborhood question. L. Sanda states that the applicant had previously stated that the drainage was all going to be handled on site and graded to work with the drainage that is there and none of that will be flowing off into the neighboring properties because that is creating a much larger impervious area than what is there now. K. Veitch states that that seemed to be what the neighbors were concerned about and lights. D. Carr indicates where a stockade fence has already been put up. D. Eskoff questions that this is the narrowest lot in the entire area. D. Carr concurs and states that some of the lots are much longer. J. Szpak states that he is not liking at all how we got ourselves into this situation and he does not know the details, but considering the situation we are in, he thinks it is reasonable that the proposal passes the use variance criteria. If he thinks about what Greenfield should have done with this property it would not have been this at all, the whole thing. We created this situation where the applicant is coming in here for a use variance and it is going to turn out to be this. He does not think that this was the best use of this property for Greenfield. D. Eskoff states that the whole character of that area has changed so much in both Wilton and Greenfield. J. Szpak states that we could have improved the character of this area better than doing this. D. Eskoff states that in looking at what is allowed in that area of town does not necessarily make sense with where we are today. Board reviews the use variance criteria. 1. Cannot realize a reasonable return – substantial as shown by competent financial evidence: K. Veitch states that this has been submitted to the Board by the applicant, T. Roohan, who is a real estate agent and has been for more than 30 years. 2. Alleged hardship is unique and does not apply to substantial portion of district or neighborhood: K. Veitch states that it is unique in the fact that the lot is so small. J. Szpak states that there are no other practical uses for it. D. Eskoff states that there are no other practical conforming uses. C. Kolakowski states that the lot itself is unique compared to

August 2, 2016

the other lots around it. L. Sanda states that the current use no longer suits the surrounding area. The way that it has been developed around this lot it is no longer feasible to continue use or to rebuild of the same use. C. Kolakowski states that it is just this one lot. L. Sanda states that this portion of Greenfield is unique when you consider Greenfield as a whole. K. Veitch states with the type of mix of uses. 3. Requested variance will not alter essential character of the neighborhood: K. Veitch states that he thinks that it is reasonable to say that the character has already been altered. J. Szpak states that there is no essential character of the neighborhood, which is what he is struggling with. L. Sanda states that the requested variance will probably better suit the current character of the neighborhood. 4. Alleged hardship has not been self-created: A. Wine states that it is not self-created because the applicant's original intent was to keep it as it was purchased, which is a single family dwelling. He asks if the applicant has any documentation for this. J. Szpak states that we do have documentation in the minutes that the triggering event was the insurance inspection.

RESOLUTION – T. Roohan, 519 Broadway LLC, Use Variance

MOTION: D. Eskoff

SECOND: K. Veitch

RESOLVED that the Zoning Board of Appeals grants a Use Variance to Tom Roohan, 519 Broadway LLC for property located at 420 Maple Avenue, TM#153.17-2-21.2, as follows:

- **The applicant has satisfied the criteria that he cannot realize a reasonable return as shown by competent financial evidence by the documentation and financial information provided to the Zoning Board**
- **The alleged hardship is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the district or neighborhood. The lot in question is unique compared to the other lots that surround it by the way that the lot has been developed; it no longer fits the essential character of the neighborhood. There is no practical conforming use for the property as it exists and this part of Greenfield is already unique in this district.**
- **The alleged hardship has not been self-created. The property was not purchased with the intent to change the use of the property. The insurance inspection was the triggering factor which changed the need for a use variance for this property and the options that were available.**
- **In looking at the overall criteria for a use variance the Zoning Board of Appeals has the power to vary or modify its application of any ordinance under the appropriate circumstances. The circumstances involved in this situation would fit that context for the purpose of a self-storage unit, up to 14 individual units, at the discretion of the Planning Board**
- **The ZBA strongly suggests that there be a full green buffer at the front portion of the property, facing Maple Avenue, that is suitable to the character of the neighborhood.**

A. Wine asks if the ZBA can ask as a further contingency that the general design of the building be close to what the rest of the surrounding properties are like. K. Veitch states that it will be the Planning Board who will make that determination and they will do a good job.

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak

Noes: None

RESOLUTION – T. Roohan, 519 Broadway LLC, Area Variance

MOTION: D. Eskoff

SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED that the Zoning Board of Appeals grants area variances to Tom Roohan, 519 Broadway LLC for property located at 420 Maple Avenue, TM#153.17-2-21.2, as follows:

August 2, 2016

- **Acreage variance of 1.671 acres**
- **Frontage variance of 70-feet**

This approval is based on the following criteria:

- **Benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant**
- **No undesirable change in neighborhood character or to nearby properties**
- **Request is not substantial given the pre-existing, non-conforming shape of the lot and the use variance that has been granted.**
- **The request will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect**
- **The alleged difficulty of the area variance is not self-created and coincides with the need to be used for the use that was granted by the Use Variance**

VOTE: Ayes: Veitch, Eskoff, Kolakowski, Sanda, Szpak
Noes: None

DISCUSSION

J. Szpak states that he understands that the Board was satisfied with the documentation. He waived without actually seeing an independent analysis of putting a new house on there and making a reasonable return. Not as much return as a self-storage unit, but a reasonable return that would give you the same use of that property. D. Eskoff states that she agrees and it was difficult. We asked for a lot of information over the course of 2 months, but some things just stand out at you as practical. J. Szpak states that what he is mad about has nothing to do with the applicant. We (Town of Greenfield) don't have a good vision of what this area could be and therefore we actually made the situation worse instead of using the new development as an opportunity to improve it.

K. Veitch states that he had a meeting this morning with T. Yasenachak and 3 Town Board members about the joint meeting that was held. The Supervisor is going to be reaching out to M. Schachner and we are going to be setting up a timeframe to sit down with him and go over questions, procedures, how we should be interacting with him, what is the best way for us to get the best information we can from him, etc. The thought was that this is something that should happen more often, twice a year, once a year, etc. At least annually because of the changes that we see in the Boards. The other thing that came up was the discussion of compensation and it is going to be presented to the Planning Board as well. K. Veitch states that one of the things that he mentioned was that if they are talking about financial, personally he would rather see the money go back into the department for helping to streamline things, workshops, etc. J. Szpak states that is how he would like to spend the money to make our jobs better and easier as volunteers, to spend the money in those up front process and for the kind of work that G. McKenna does. K. Veitch states that G. McKenna used to come to these meetings for the opportunity to discuss and in some cases there are things that we just need to hear from him. J. Szpak states that he thinks that G. McKenna needs to have the Board's perspective too because he misses a lot of value in our discussions. D. Eskoff states that in reading the minutes you are not getting someone's tone of voice, etc. She would have liked to have had him here tonight because this is the type of case where she would have had a lot of deference for him and she is not sure we would have agreed on everything here. Board consensus is that they would rather the compensation go to have G. McKenna be present. Further discussion takes place about other municipalities who pay their boards. J. Szpak states that he likes the workshop concept. K. Veitch states that there is criteria that should be met before applicants reach the boards and that has to be controlled somehow. It wouldn't be a bad idea for any of the ZBA to sit in on a Planning Board meeting, especially the one we have just handed off to them. D. Eskoff states that she would like to see the Town Board come to ZBA meetings. K. Veitch states that he thinks that has been resolved because they thought that if they were to come sit at a meeting, it would look

August 2, 2106

like they are here to influence the Board somehow. J. Szpak states that he liked the discussion on fines, putting some teeth into the law, for purposeful violators.

Meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary